
RE-APPEAL TO SYNOD

By

ADOLPH A. BRUX, PH. D.

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY
SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS

1 9 3 8

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	
Why a Re-appeal?.....	
Settlement in Committee at Cleveland and Meaning of Committee Report...	
Violation by Dr. Brand and the Board of Foreign Missions of the Settlement effected by Synod, whereby Synod's Resolution has virtually been set aside	
Meeting of November 7, 1935, in Chicago.....	
Synod's Position on Prayer-Fellowship in the Light of Synod's Adoption of the doctrinal Statement in the Committee Report.....	
Demonstration that the Interpretation which Dr. Brand, the Board of Foreign Missions, and Dr. Pfotenbauer now put on the doctrinal Statement of the Committee Report is untenable.....	
Refusal of Dr. Arndt to give written Proof of his Charge of Heresy.....	
Refusal of Dr. Arndt to make Amends for his Misrepresentation of Facts...	
Details of Procedure adopted against me by Dr. Brand, the Board of Foreign Missions, and Dr. Pfotenbauer prior to my Appeal in 1934.....	
Summary of Pleas made to Synod in this Re-appeal.....	
Appendix: Review of Dr. Arndt's Position on Prayer-Fellowship as presented on pp. 60-67 of his <i>Christian Prayer</i> (St. Louis, 1937)....	

Please supply your delegates with copies of this "Re-appeal." Additional copies will be sent on request. Please address Adolph A. Brux, Ph.D., Ingleside Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	1
Why a Re-appeal?	2
Settlement in Committee at Cleveland and Meaning of Committee Report	3
Violation by Dr. Brand and the Board of Foreign Missions of the Settlement effected by Synod, whereby Synod's Resolution has virtually been set aside	17
Meeting of November 7, 1935, in Chicago	26
Synod's Position on Prayer-Fellowship in the Light of Synod's Adoption of the doctrinal Statement in the Committee Report	32
Demonstration that the Interpretation which Dr. Brand, the Board of Foreign Missions, and Dr. Pfotenhauer now put on the doctrinal Statement of the Committee Report is untenable	35
Refusal of Dr. Arndt to give written Proof of his Charge of Heresy	37
Refusal of Dr. Arndt to make Amends for his Misrepresentation of Facts.	45
Details of Procedure adopted against me by Dr. Brand, the Board of Foreign Missions, and Dr. Pfotenhauer prior to my Appeal in 1934	54
Summary of Pleas made to Synod in this Re-appeal	56
Appendix: Review of Dr. Arndt's Position on Prayer-Fellowship as presented on pp. 60-67 of his <i>Christian Prayer</i> (St. Louis, 1937)	57

Please supply your delegates with copies of this "Re-appeal." Additional copies will be sent on request. Please address Adolph A. Brux, Ph.D., 5432 Ingleside Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

FOREWORD

A re-appeal of my case to Synod was made necessary by the attitude and action of Dr. Brand and the Board of Foreign Missions after the case had been settled amicably at Synod in 1935. The heart of that settlement was agreement on the doctrinal statement embodied in the Report, and in view of this agreement an investigation of my charges against Dr. Brand, the Board of Foreign Missions, and Dr. Pfotenbauer was not pressed, since it had been agreed mutually in committee that doctrinal agreement on the issue of prayer-fellowship could be achieved, the other matters would be disposed of in an amicable way. The Committee Report therefore avoided any direct statement of guilt or acquittal, though the upholding of my eligibility and the "recommendation" (instruction) to return me to India leave no one in doubt as to who was right and who was wrong. However, Dr. Brand and the Board of Foreign Missions have shown by their attitude and action their acceptance of the Report by Synod that they are not willing to leave matters as is, but are determined to extract an admission of guilt from me, in particular by making my return to India dependent on the acceptance of a *new* call, so that it could not be said that I was *reinstated*, and by making the payment of salary dependent on the acceptance of a new call. Failing to secure an admission of guilt, the Board renewed its former charge of heresy. Under these circumstances I am constrained to inform Synod of Dr. Brand's and the Board's violation of Synod's resolution and to furnish evidence that the Committee Report did not condemn and that Synod's acceptance of the Report and its doctrinal statement was an exoneration of the charge of "heresy" on the basis of which Dr. Brand and the Board had held me dismissed. The need for doing this was emphasized by the appearance of Dr. Arndt's booklet *Christian Prayer* (St. Louis, 1937), in the last chapter of which Dr. Arndt sets forth, ostensibly as Synod's position, a view on prayer-fellowship that is unscriptural and in violation of the position adopted by Synod in 1935 (see Appendix). I would fail in my duty toward Synod if in this situation I remained silent.

The present *Re-appeal* together with the review of the last chapter of Dr. Arndt's booklet thus goes out to the members of Synod, and especially to its pastors, with the urgent plea that they study the issue carefully on the basis of the scriptures and do their part to guard the scriptural position adopted by Synod in 1935 against the unscriptural claims advanced by Dr. Arndt, Dr. Brand, the Board of Foreign Missions, and Dr. Pfotenbauer.

The position on prayer-fellowship expressed in the doctrinal statement embodied in the Committee Report and accepted by Synod at Cleveland over against the unscriptural position advocated by Dr. Arndt, Dr. Brand, the Board of Foreign Missions, and Dr. Pfotenbauer is set forth in detail in my paper *Christian Prayer-fellowship and Unionism: An Investigation of Our Synodical Position with Respect to Prayer-Fellowship with Christians of Other Denominations* (1935). This may be secured at the price of \$.30 per copy, postpaid. Please address Adolph A. Brux, D., 5432 Ingleside Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

1938.

ADOLPH A. BRUX.

FOREWORD

A re-appeal of my case to Synod was made necessary by the attitude and action of Dr. Brand and the Board of Foreign Missions after the case had been settled amicably at Synod in 1985. The heart of that settlement was agreement on the doctrinal statement embodied in the Report, and in view of this agreement an investigation of my charges against Dr. Brand, the Board of Foreign Missions, and Dr. Pfotenhauer was not pressed, since it had been agreed mutually in committee that doctrinal agreement on the issue of Prayer-fellowship could be achieved, the other matters would be disposed of in an amicable way. The Committee Report therefore avoided any direct statement of guilt or acquittal, though the upholding of my eligibility and the "recommendation" (instruction) to return me to India soon leave no one in doubt as to who was right and who was wrong. However, Dr. Brand and the Board of Foreign Missions have shown by their attitude and action the acceptance of the Report by Synod that they are not willing to leave matters as, but are determined to extract an admission of guilt from me, in particular by making my return to India dependent on the acceptance of a *new* call, so that it could not be said that I was *reinstated*, and by making the payment of salary dependent on the acceptance of a new call. Failing to secure an admission of guilt, the Board renewed its former charge of heresy. Under these circumstances I am constrained to inform Synod of Dr. Brand's and the Board's violation of Synod's solution and to furnish evidence that the Committee Report did not condemn me and that Synod's acceptance of the Report and its doctrinal statement was an exoneration of the charge of "heresy" on the basis of which Dr. Brand and the Board had held me dismissed. The need for doing this was emphasized by the appearance of Dr. Arndt's booklet *Christian Prayer* (St. Louis, 1937), in the last chapter of which Dr. Arndt sets forth, ostensibly as Synod's position, a view on prayer-fellowship that is unscriptural and in violation of the position adopted by Synod in 1935 (see Appendix). I would fail in my duty toward Synod if in this situation I remained silent.

The present Re-appeal together with the review of the last chapter of Dr. Arndt's booklet thus goes out to the members of Synod, and especially to its pastors with the urgent plea that they study the issue carefully on the basis of the Scriptures and do their part to guard the scriptural position adopted by Synod in 1935 against the unscriptural claims advanced by Dr. Arndt, Dr. Brand, the Board of Foreign Missions, and Dr. Pfotenhauer.

The position on prayer-fellowship expressed in the doctrinal statement embodied in the Committee Report and accepted by Synod at Cleveland over against unscriptural position advocated by Dr. Arndt, Dr. Brand, the Board of Foreign Missions, and Dr. Pfotenhauer is set forth in detail in my paper *Christian Prayer-fellowship and Unionism: An Investigation of Our Synodical Position with Respect to Prayer-Fellowship with Christians of Other Denominations* (1935). This may be procured at the price of \$.30 per copy, postpaid. Please address Adolph A. Brux, Ph.D., 5432 Ingleside Avenue, Chicago, Illinois,

April 30, 1938.

ADOLPH A. BRUX.

WHY A RE-APPEAL?

Under date of Sept. 30, 1935, I wrote the following letter to the President of Synod, Dr. J. W. Behnken:

"My dear President:

"I have the unpleasant task of calling your attention to what appears to me to be a clear violation, on the part of the Board of Foreign Missions, of the settlement of my case effected at Synod on June 26, 1935.

"In Committee 22B, to which my case had been referred, the representatives of the Board of Foreign Missions gave the unequivocal promise that on amicable settlement of the case the Board would in every way do for me what Christian love and fairness would require, also in a financial way. As a Christian I could not but take the representatives of the Board of Foreign Missions at their word and, among other things, including the acceptance of the position on prayer-fellowship which I had contended for, was led by this declaration of the representatives of the Board to meet the Board more than half way in order to achieve an amicable settlement.

"Since the Report of Committee 22B was accepted by Synod on June 26, 1935, over three months have now elapsed; but I have not yet had the pleasure of experiencing the Christian love and fairness promised by the representatives of the Board. On the contrary, in reply to my inquiry of July 3, if I am now on salary (for I had been promised by Dr. Arndt at Cleveland that my salary would begin again as of July 1, 1935), I was informed by the Board under date of July 8, 'That you are not on the salary of the Board; that you will not be on salary of the Board until you shall have obtained a call here in the States—in case the medical examinations to which we asked you and your family to submit should result in an unfavorable verdict; that a one-time grant of \$150.00 be made to you which will reach you as soon as we can get the money from the Fiscal Office. Since you asked for a "clear reply to each of the two questions," we trust the foregoing will be satisfactory.'

"The negative attitude manifested in this letter of the Board forced me to seek other employment than that recommended for me by Synod, in order that I might provide the necessities of life for my family. Moreover, financial settlement for the period of Nov. 30, 1932, to June 30, 1935, has been refused by the Board, as Dr. Brand informed me on his visit here on Sept. 2, 1935.

"This attitude and action on the part of the Board of Foreign Missions clearly constitutes a violation of the settlement effected at Synod and invalidates and overthrows this settlement. The Board of Foreign Missions has thus placed matters in *statum quo ante Synodum*. This fact compels me to inform you that my former appeal again lies before Synod, and that to the charges raised therein against the Board of Foreign Missions and its General Secretary the charge of violation of the agreement reached at Synod is now added.

"The requisite documents will be submitted to you and to Synod in due time.

Sincerely yours,

A. BRUX."

In order to understand fully the position taken by me in the foregoing letter with respect to the Board of Foreign Missions* and its General Secretary, Dr. F. Brand, it is necessary to know:

1) what settlement was achieved in committee at Cleveland in 1935 and what the import and meaning of the Committee Report is that was accepted by Synod;

*Hereafter usually abbreviated to B. F. M.

2) how the settlement accepted by Synod in the Committee Report has been violated by Dr. Brand and the B. F. M. and how Synod's resolution has thereby virtually been set aside.

I

SETTLEMENT IN COMMITTEE AT CLEVELAND AND MEANING OF THE REPORT

Committee 22B, to which my appeal had been referred, sought to achieve an *amicable* settlement based on doctrinal agreement and mutual readiness to forgive and forget matters of procedure rather than a *judicial* settlement resulting from an investigation of the charges raised in the appeal against Dr. Brand, the B. F. M., and Pres. Pfotenhauer (for these charges see pp. 54-56). This fact should be kept in mind when considering the Report of the Committee.

After a series of eventually successful meetings the Committee, on June 24, 1935, unanimously approved the following Report:

"Your Committee, appointed to study the appeal of Dr. Brux, who served as Missionary to the Mohammedans in India during the years 1923 to 1932, has had a number of meetings with Dr. Brux and also with several other brethren who kindly offered their services to clear up this case of long standing, one of the great issues involved being that of prayer-fellowship. We are happy to report that agreement has been reached on the following statement with respect to prayer-fellowship, which we consider satisfactory:

"1. So far as direct Scripture teaching on prayer-fellowship is concerned, there is no passage, so far as we know, that expressly prohibits prayer-fellowship with erring Christians whom we must still regard as members of the universal Christian church.

"2. There are, however, passages which prohibit compromise of the truth indifference to doctrine, unionism, and giving of offense.

"3. Hence every kind of prayer-fellowship which involves one of these objectionable features must be avoided.

"He [Dr. Brux] states that this has always been his doctrinal position.

"Your Committee also discussed with Dr. Brux that section of his essay treating of the clarity of Scriptures (page 97, note). As to this, Dr. Brux declared that he in no manner questions the clarity of Scriptures and is in full agreement with our church's doctrinal position. Furthermore, he states that if there is any passage in his essay which anyone is inclined to interpret as being unscriptural, he is willing to reconstruct such a statement or to withdraw it entirely.

"As for the essay in question, Dr. Brux states that he had never considered the treatise as final, but rather as a contribution for the discussion of the issue.

"Therefore we hold that Brother Brux is eligible for the ministry.

"Since Dr. Brux has spent so many years in very special preparation for the work as minister to the Mohammedans, and since he has proven himself especially qualified to bring the gospel to Mohammedan peoples, we recommend to Synod to instruct the Board of Foreign Missions to reinstate him in his chosen work.*

*After the wording of this paragraph had been accepted unanimously, it was felt by some, including members of the B. F. M., that the words "instruct the B. F. M. to reinstate him in his chosen work" are unnecessarily severe in an amicable settlement and that a "recommendation" by Synod "to reinstate him in his chosen work" would serve as well, and when the representatives of the B. F. M. stated that the BOARD WOULD UNDERSTAND THE WORD "RECOMMEND" IN THE SENSE OF "INSTRUCT," it was agreed to substitute the word "recommend" for "instruct." On this point compare the statement of Attorney Otto Rentner, a member of the Committee, on pp. 13 f.

"The Word of God makes certain statements concerning unionism and prayer-fellowship. In the field of casuistry we are confronted with many situations that cause no little perplexity in our church body. In fact, the matter of Christian prayer-fellowship has become a burning question. The attitudes toward it vary greatly. Some recognize cautiously the limits of Christian fellowship according to their convictions in the light of Scripture; others show themselves sadly indifferent. Others, again, are filled with doubt and uncertainty as to what might be God-pleasing prayer-fellowship and know not at all what they should do. This is indeed a serious situation in our present-day Christian life where we associate with people of other denominations, and where we reach out to gain the unchurched and to convince the erring. In view of this situation, your Committee recommends that—as for instance in the case of the lodge question—Synod appoint a committee through its President to guide us all in a thorough study of Scripture as pertaining to prayer-fellowship with a sound application to church practice and Christian life, with the instruction to report at next Synod. Pertinent studies might then be published in the *Theological Monthly*, *Lutheran Witness*, and *Lutheraner*, so that we might gain a uniform practice and our pastors and laity might be able to proceed in this important matter of prayer-fellowship with absolute certainty, unharrassed by so much wavering.

"Upon acceptance of this Report Dr. Brux withdraws his appeal.

"Very respectfully submitted by Committee 22B on Appeals."

(Hereafter this Report will be referred to as the first version of the Report.)

Among those concurring in the doctrinal statement given in this first version were Drs. Fuerbringer and Arndt. Its scripturalness was again acknowledged by Dr. Arndt in his memorandum to the B. F. M. dated Sept. 17, 1935 (see p. 23, par. 7), and again in a meeting in Chicago on Nov. 7, 1935 (see p. 31).

On the evening of June 24, 1935, this Report was read to Dr. Pfothenhauer, who did not find it to his liking. On the following morning an attempt was made in committee to show that Rom. 16, 17-18 does forbid prayer-fellowship with Christians of other denominations, and a number of brethren besides myself showed that it does not. In the afternoon I was approached by Dr. Engelder with the suggestion to reword the doctrinal statement thus: "Scriptures very plainly prohibit compromise of the truth, indifference to doctrine, unionism, and giving of offense, and therefore forbid every kind of prayer-fellowship which involves one of these objectionable features. There are in the domain of casuistry cases where the question whether unionistic prayer-fellowship is involved cannot be answered in advance." In reply to my question whether the first sentence of my doctrinal statement in the first version of the Report ("So far as direct Scripture teaching on prayer-fellowship is concerned, there is no passage, so far as we know, that expressly prohibits prayer-fellowship with erring Christians whom we must still regard as members of the universal Christian church") is agreed to and understood in the newly proposed statement, I was assured by Dr. Engelder, Dr. Arndt, and the members of the Committee that it is. With that understanding, which, as every reader may assure himself, gave to the proposed wording the same meaning as that expressed more fully in the first version of the Report, I agreed to substitute the briefer statement for the longer one.

This matter having been disposed of, members of the Board objected to a statement by me on page 15 of my printed *Appeal*: "By ignoring my protest against the Board's violating the most sacred principle of the Lutheran Church, viz. that

the Scriptures alone are the sole rule and norm of doctrine and life, and by ignoring the protests of the numerous brethren referred to above, the Board has grievously transgressed the law of brotherly love and has *deliberately given great offense*, not only to the brethren immediately concerned, but to all who have learned of it," and assured me and all present that they did not deliberately give offence. I accepted their assurance rather than believe what the action of the Board seemed to indicate and expressed regret for having made the statement.*

Asked to withdraw the charge of false doctrine against Synod, I replied that I would do so temporarily, pending acceptance of the Report, including my doctrinal statement, by Synod. When it was pointed out that a temporary withdrawal would hardly do in view of the fact that the Report was to be accepted by Synod as a definite settlement, I agreed to withdraw the charge definitely because the doctrinal statement had been accepted by the Committee as scriptural.

Dr. Arndt and Rev. Kretzschmar promised on behalf of the Board that the Board on its part would do what love and Christian fairness required, also in a financial way, and to make it emphatic called on the brethren present to hold them to the promise if the Board failed to carry it out.

With the understanding that the rest of the matters that required to be mentioned in the Report *were to remain as agreed on in the first version*, which included the statement that "upon acceptance of this Report Dr. Brux withdraws his appeal" (see p. 4), the Committee's open meeting closed and the Committee went into executive session to give to the Report its final shape and wording. With others I left the room. Dr. Arndt, however, stayed and, as I was informed by the Chairman on the following morning, helped in the phrasing of the Report.

On the morning of June 26, 1935, while Synod was in session, the final wording of the Report was submitted to me by Chairman Strieter and Attorney Otto Rentner. Asked by me how it happened that Dr. Arndt remained for the executive session of the Committee, Rev. Strieter apologetically declared that I should have been invited too.† On reading the Report I objected to the word "therefore" in the sentence: "Therefore we hold Brother Brux eligible for the ministry," because this wording seemed to me to imply that my eligibility was established in view of what preceded rather than declared apart from the preceding, and both Attorney Rentner and Rev. Strieter agreed to strike the word "therefore," stating that this sentence was independent of what preceded and would accordingly be

*This expression of regret was elaborated in the final version of the Report to read: "Dr. Brux expresses regret for the publication of any subjective judgments." Dr. Graebner, in reporting on the case in the Lutheran Witness on June 27, added to the Report, without any authorization whatever, "The Committee interpreted this phrase 'subjective judgments' to mean that all charges against persons made by Dr. Brux in his publications are withdrawn"—as if all charges in my APPEAL were only subjective judgments! I protested against this to the Chairman of the Committee, who in turn protested to Dr. Graebner. On this Rev. Strieter wrote on July 6, 1935, to the Secretary of Synod, Rev. M. F. Kretzmann: "I spoke to Dr. Graebner about the sentence in parenthesis which he permitted himself to publish inside our Report in the Daily Witness. He accepted my protest. So you will kindly omit that parenthetical statement of Dr. Graebner entirely. If Synod should desire any interpretation at all, then Brother Brux' must stand: 'The Committee interpreted withdrawal of the APPEAL to mean that all charges against persons made by Dr. Brux in his publications are now withdrawn.'" Dr. Graebner, however, failed to rectify his parenthetical remark.

†This point came up for discussion at the meeting in Chicago on Nov. 7, 1935. The minutes (p. 25) read: "DR. ARNDT: Who was the member of the B. F. M. who was present at the drawing up of the final wording of the altered draft? DR. BRUX: Invited by the Committee you joined with the Committee. DR. ARNDT: You were there I recall. DR. BRUX: I remained seated. Rev. Strieter said, 'If Dr. Arndt was present they should have invited you too.' [This sentence illustrates what happens when a stenographic record is refused (see p. 27). What I said was: 'I did NOT remain seated, but left the room. Rev. Strieter said to me on the next morning when he presented the final draft: 'If Dr. Arndt was present they should have invited you too.'"] THE REV. STRIETER: Several who were not invited wanted to stay, I did not expect them to stay. All other members present. DR. BRUX: There were other members present outside of the Committee. What business would the other members have outside of the Committee? THE REV. STRIETER: What business these other members had or not is no reason. Why must such positive statements be made?"

given as an independent paragraph. I objected furthermore to the wording of the second paragraph on the ground that withdrawal of the appeal was *in view of the amicable settlement reached*, and that withdrawal of the charge of false doctrine was *in view of the acceptance of my doctrinal statement*. Rev. Strieter replied: "We mean it in that way," adding, however, that such an extensive change in the wording could not be undertaken without calling the Committee together again, and that this was out of the question since the Report was scheduled to be read to Synod that very morning. Reluctantly I accepted Rev. Strieter's assurance. The Report was brought before Synod and accepted shortly before noon. It read:

"Your Committee, appointed to study the appeal of Dr. A. Brux, who served as missionary to the Mohammedans from 1923 to 1932, had a number of meetings with Dr. Brux and the other parties concerned to clear up this case of long standing. We are happy to state that we have come to a satisfactory conclusion.

"Dr. Brux states that he withdraws his appeal and expresses his regret for the publication of any subjective judgments. He withdraws the charge of false doctrine against Synod. As for the essay on Prayer-Fellowship, he states that he had never considered the treatise as final, but merely as a contribution to the discussion of the issue. Dr. Brux states his doctrinal position thus:

"Scriptures very plainly prohibit compromise of the truth, indifference to doctrine, unionism, and giving of offense, and therefore forbid every kind of prayer-fellowship which involves one of these objectionable features. There are in the domain of casuistry cases where the question whether unionistic prayer-fellowship is involved cannot be answered in advance."

"As to the Clarity of Scriptures (page 97, note, of the essay), Dr. Brux declares that he in no manner questions the clarity of Scriptures and is in full agreement with our church's doctrinal position. Furthermore, he states that if there is any passage in his essay which anyone is inclined to interpret as being unscriptural, he is willing to reconstruct such a statement or to withdraw it entirely.

"We hold Brother Brux eligible for the ministry.

"Since Dr. Brux has spent so many years in very special preparation for the work as missionary to the Mohammedans, and since he has proven himself especially qualified to bring the gospel to Mohammedans, we recommend that he be returned to the field of his former endeavors.

"We furthermore recommend that the Pastoral Conferences throughout Synod earnestly and diligently study the Scripture passages pertinent to the question of prayer-fellowship.

"Very respectfully submitted by Committee 22B on Appeals."

During the noon recess following adoption of the Report by Synod I met with Rev. Strieter and again called his attention to the inadequate wording of the second paragraph and to the inevitable requests for its interpretation that would be made of me, and asked point blank: "If, when requested to explain the meaning of the second paragraph of the Report, I state the withdrawal of the appeal to have been in view of the amicable settlement reached, and the withdrawal of the charge of false doctrine to have been in view of the acceptance of my doctrinal statement, will I have the right to say that this is the interpretation of the Committee?" Rev. Strieter replied unequivocally: "You have the right to state this."

While this statement by Rev. Strieter reassured me of the meaning attached by the Committee to the second paragraph of the Report, it did not take care of the unfortunate wording itself, and under date of July 3, 1935, I wrote Rev. Strieter:

"When on the morning of June 26 you submitted the Report of your Committee to me for perusal, I requested that the statement, 'Dr. Brux states that he withdraws his appeal,' be worded: 'Dr. Brux states that in view of the amicable settlement reached in committee he withdraws his appeal.' This was, as you remember, in accordance with the statement which had been agreed on in the first draft that 'upon acceptance of this Report Dr. Brux withdraws his appeal.' You and Mr. Rentner pleaded that there was not time to effect the change and that the words, as they stand, convey that meaning. Worn out by days of fatiguing and exhausting negotiations, I accepted your word, though not fully satisfied in my own mind. After repeated perusal and careful consideration since then, and after obtaining also the considered opinion of other brethren, I can not be satisfied that my words as stated by the Committee convey the meaning intended by me and, as you assured me, intended also by the Committee. This is true also of the statement, 'He withdraws the charge of false doctrine against Synod.' For this statement, too, was not made absolutely, as recorded by the Committee, but in view of the agreement reached on the doctrinal statement of my position. I feel, therefore, in duty and conscience bound to request you to have the following proposed statement added in the Proceedings of the Convention as an explanatory footnote to my statements as given in the Report of the Committee:

"In drawing up this Report the Committee sought to be as brief as possible and, in quoting Dr. Brux' statements, inadvertently left out some essential words. The statements should read: "Dr. Brux states that in view of the settlement reached in committee he withdraws his appeal and expresses regret for the publication of any subjective judgments. In view of the acceptance of his doctrinal statement with respect to prayer-fellowship, he also withdraws the charge of false doctrine against Synod." The words "which anyone is inclined to interpret" have, of course, the meaning: "which anyone, on clear and sufficient evidence, is inclined to interpret."—Rev. T. W. Strieter, Chairman."

"Since I have been assured by you that my words were taken in the above sense and that it was the intention of the Committee to convey this meaning in the Report, the addition of the proposed footnote will in no wise impair the Report of the Committee, but rather serve to clarify it.

"In addition to the above, the following facts appear to me to require the addition of the footnote:

"1. When the final wording of the Report was being made, I was not asked to be present and was not given an opportunity to correct inadequate wording of my own statements, while, as you informed me later on, *a member of the Board of Foreign Missions was asked to be present and to help in phrasing the final draft.*

"2. The words concerned are not words of the Committee, but are given by the Committee *as my own statements.* I should, therefore, in justice and fairness, be given the opportunity to correct any wrong meaning or impression conveyed by your quoting my words only in part and in a sense which they did not have when spoken in the Committee.

"3. My own conscience will not permit my words to be quoted in an official document in a sense different from that intended by me.

"I trust that you will agree that the foregoing reasons are sufficient to warrant the addition of the proposed footnote, and I await your kind and early assurance that you are instructing the Secretary, Rev. Kretzmann, to have the note printed in the Proceedings along with the Report of the Committee."

A copy of this letter was sent to Rev. M. F. Kretzmann, the Secretary of Synod. On July 9 Rev. Strieter replied:

"Remember that our Committee is discharged and therefore has no official function whatsoever. Hence, I also have no right to instruct Secretary Kretzmann to add anything to his entry in the Proceedings. Yet, if it will meet with your approval, I shall send him the following statement in the hope that he will append it to the official Report:

"(Explanatory note:) In drawing up this Report the Committee sought to be brief. Dr. Brux felt that some statements were really too brief and that he preferred the following reading: "In view of the settlement reached in the Committee, Dr. Brux withdraws his appeal and expresses regret for the publication of any subjective judgments. In view of full agreement on the above doctrinal statement with respect to prayer-fellowship, he also withdraws the charge of false doctrine against Synod." The words "which anyone is inclined to interpret" have of course, the meaning: "which anyone, on clear and sufficient evidence, is inclined to interpret."—T. W. Strieter, Chairman."

"I await your kind reply before sending this to Rev. M. F. Kretzmann."

In my reply of July 11 I suggested the following change in the wording of the statement:

"In drawing up this Report the Committee sought to be brief. Dr. Brux felt that some statements were really too brief and that, in order to avoid any misunderstanding of his statements, he preferred the following reading: 'In view of the settlement reached in the Committee, Dr. Brux withdraws his appeal and expresses regret for the publication of any subjective judgments. In view of full agreement on the following doctrinal statement with respect to prayer-fellowship, he also withdraws the charge of false doctrine against Synod.'—The words 'which anyone is inclined to interpret' have, of course, the meaning: 'which anyone, on clear and sufficient evidence, is inclined to interpret.'—T. W. Strieter, Chairman,"

This revised statement was presented to Rev. Kretzmann in St. Louis on July

17. Regarding this Rev. Strieter wrote me on the same date:

"This morning I found your letter, and also one from Rev. M. F. Kretzmann stating that he would have to have the 'footnote' in St. Louis this morning to present it to Dr. Behnken at this time at the latest. I phoned to the L. L. L. office and dictated your paragraph of 107 words to Miss Nagel. She will hand it to Pastor Kretzmann and send me a copy. I trust President Behnken will permit the appendix to be included in the publication."

The request to have Rev. Strieter's statement added in the Proceedings as a footnote to the Report was denied. Furthermore, soon after consideration by synodical officials of the requested footnote Rev. Strieter suddenly saw fit to execute a complete about-face; for when on July 23 Dr. Brand requested of Rev. Strieter an interpretation of the Committee's Report, he replied on July 30:

"Here is my unequivocal answer to your question:

"1. Dr. Brux retracted the charge that Synod teaches false doctrine on the question of prayer-fellowship with heterodox Christians. The statement which he and the Committee jointly accepted and which was endorsed by Synod shows that he is in agreement with Synod's position. The Committee (and the various competent pastors and professors with the Committee) had no reason to doubt the sincerity of his retraction.

"2. Dr. Brux, furthermore, withdrew the passage in his essay on the clarity of Scripture, acknowledging that the sense which many brethren found in his words was false doctrine.

"3. Dr. Brux was shown that some of the statements he had made violated brotherly love—a fact which he acknowledged.

"4. Dr. Brux was much worried about exegetical questions which the Committee had no time to investigate and which it considered of minor importance. It seems that the study of these questions, in which full agreement cannot be attained in this life, led him to become critical of Synod's position.

"5. If the Committee had felt that the unfortunate situation was due to any action of the F. M. B. and that Dr. Brux was treated unfairly, it would not have hesitated to say so.

"6. It is not surprising that some of the friends of Dr. Brux, who were not present at the discussions of the Committee with him, take an unwarranted view of the situation. We shall simply have to let them talk, and we hope that their unfavorable criticism will not do great harm. It seems inconceivable that any of those who attended the deliberations can indulge in such criticism."

This from the same man who at Synod repeatedly assured me that the second paragraph of the Report was meant by the Committee in the sense that I demanded in my objection to the wording, and who agreed to submit, and actually submitted, over his own signature, a statement embodying my own meaning (see p. 8) to be appended to the Report as a footnote! The "interpretation" given by Rev. Strieter to Dr. Brand is such grievous misrepresentation that time must be taken here to expose it.

1. Rev. Strieter's statements in his par. 1 violate the very words of the Report. The Report says nothing whatever of any retraction, but merely that "he withdraws his appeal" and that "he withdraws the charge of false doctrine against Synod," the withdrawal being understood, as Rev. Strieter acknowledged (see his signed statement above on p. 8 and also his message to Rev. M. F. Kretzmann), "in view of the settlement reached in the Committee" and "in view of full agreement on the . . . doctrinal statement with respect to prayer-fellowship." Furthermore, the position taken in this doctrinal statement, which has as its admitted premise (see p. 4) the fact that "there is no [Scripture] passage . . . that expressly prohibits prayer-fellowship with erring Christians whom we must still regard as members of the universal Christian church," was not the position of the B. F. M.—if it had been there would never have been a controversy—nor the position of Synod as interpreted by the then President of Synod and other synodical officials, though it is in keeping with the position of our confessional writings and above all of our Catechism. The position of our Catechism (Q. 222: "Why are we to say, 'Our Father'? Because all believers are in Christ the children of one Father, and should, therefore, pray for and with each other.") is the position I have been contending for since 1924 over against a so-called "official" position taken by synodical officials and by various writers in our synodical literature (see my paper *Christian Prayer-Fellowship and Unionism*, especially pp. 4-6 and 75-101). The position taken in my paper is summarized (pp. 100 f.) thus:

"Our present synodical position* with respect to prayer-fellowship with Christians of other denominations is that such prayer-fellowship is not permissible on scriptural grounds.

"The foregoing scriptural investigation of this position has revealed to us:

"1. That the Bible passages of group I (see p. 7; also pp. 8-48) refer to

*I. e., as interpreted by Dr. Brand, the B. F. M., Dr. Pfotenhauer, and certain writers in our periodicals.

such persons as may not be regarded as Christians, or, as in the case of 2 Thess. 3, 6-15, clearly enjoin that Christian religious fellowship should be maintained.

"2. That the Bible passages of group II (see p. 7; also pp. 49-66) do not prove that prayer-fellowship with Christians differing from us in doctrines which do not overthrow the foundation inherently involves a violation of confessional conscience and therefore unionism (compromise of truth).

"3. That there is, therefore, *not one Bible passage to uphold Synod's negative position, and that the claim that the Scriptures forbid prayer-fellowship with Christians of other denominations thus falls to the ground.*

"4. That, on the contrary, the Scriptures (Eph. 2, 18; 3, 12) base prayer and prayer-fellowship on fundamental faith in Christ as Redeemer, not on agreement in every particular of doctrine, and thereby make prayer-fellowship an act of universal Christian fellowship and a normal expression of the existing brotherhood of all Christians in the universal church.

"5. That prayer-fellowship with Christians of other denominations becomes impossible *only when circumstances carry into the act such implications as will necessarily involve a violation of the confessional position and conscience and thereby give offense.*

"6. *That Synod's negative position breaks down in practice, because it is felt by many to violate the facts and truths of the universal church, and that it should, therefore, be changed to conform to what the Scriptures teach with respect to the church, to prayer, and to prayer-fellowship, to wit (Eph. 2, 18-22 and 4, 1-6)."*

The doctrinal position unanimously agreed on in committee at Cleveland is, in the longer form:

"1. So far as direct Scripture teaching on prayer-fellowship is concerned, there is no passage, so far as we know, that expressly prohibits prayer-fellowship with erring Christians whom we must still regard as members of the universal Christian church.

"2. There are, however, passages which prohibit compromise of the truth, indifference to doctrine, unionism, and giving of offense.

"3. Hence every kind of prayer-fellowship which involves one of these objectionable features must be avoided."

In the shorter form, in which the first paragraph of the longer form is admittedly implied (see p. 4), the statement reads:

"Scriptures very plainly prohibit compromise of the truth, indifference to doctrine, unionism, and giving of offense, and therefore forbid every kind of prayer-fellowship *which involves one of these objectionable features.* There are in the domain of casuistry cases where the question whether unionistic prayer-fellowship is involved cannot be answered in advance."

Compare either of these two statements with the so-called "official" position summarized by Eckhardt in his *Reallexikon* on the basis of various synodical publications and given in *Christian Prayer-Fellowship and Unionism*, pp. 4 f., in English translation, thus:

"1) God's word commands that we have no communion with teachers of false doctrines. Rom. 16, 17; Matth. 7, 15.

"2) We are to confess Christ and our faith before men, Matth. 10, 32. *This duty is not to be shirked for even half an hour for the purpose of joining in common prayer with those who differ from us in doctrine.*

"3) We must avoid becoming partakers of other men's sins, 2 John 11,

which we should become, if we should join in prayer with believers of false doctrines.

"4) By common prayer we should pretend complete unity with them when, as a matter of fact, there is no unity. This is hypocrisy. The mouth simulates concord of which the heart knows nothing. It would be false-heartedness, if an assembly, the one part of which rejects what the other teaches, should pray together.

"5) We should be praying against one another. Whereas we, e. g., should pray for the victory of *sola gratia*, others would pray for the victory of their false doctrine and for the defeat of the divine truth. Not even the Lord's Prayer could be prayed with the same meaning by two differing parties.

"6) He who says 'A' must say 'B.' He who begins partnership in prayer must consequently also introduce partnership in the pulpit and in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Common prayer without common pulpit would be a contradiction.

"7) The result would be: the false doctrine would appear harmless and indifferent, while the true doctrine would be forgotten.

"8) We are to give no offense. Not only those who believe false doctrines, but also the weak in faith among us would regard such practice as acceptance and unionistic tolerance of their false doctrines.

"9) Also our confessional writings take this position. Mueller, 724, pars. 95-99; 703, par. 31. (*Triglot*, pp. 1095 and 1063.)

"10) At the time of the religious discussion between Lutherans, Reformed, Catholics, and Herrnhuters, the Lutherans declined to join in common prayer. (Given by Eckhardt as *g* under 22: Concerning joint prayer at free conferences between Ohio, Iowa, and Missouri.)

"Note a) One cannot pray together with one who has been excommunicated.

"b) Under this head belongs also the misuse of prayer at the opening ceremonies of conventions, world's fairs, congresses, and parliaments, where now a Unitarian, now a Jew speaks the prayer.

"c) If in a city or village there be no church that believes and teaches the pure doctrine, one ought to hold services in one's own house.

"d) If one is compelled by circumstances to be present at the worship of those who hold false tenets, one ought to maintain proper conduct, even though one does not join in the prayers.

"e) Despite this position we do not regard believers in false doctrines as non-Christians.

"Objection: Such a position reveals lack of love and a spirit of contentious dogmatism.

"Answer: It is a mark of true love not to accede to every wrong wish of our fellowmen."

This so-called "official" position leaves no room for any cases of prayer-fellowship whatsoever with Christians disagreeing from us in doctrine, but *assumes that every case of such prayer-fellowship thereby involves compromise of the truth, indifference to doctrine, unionism, and giving of offense.* The doctrinal statement accepted at Synod, however, clearly declares that only "prayer-fellowship which involves one of these objectionable features" is forbidden, and, taking the ground that the question whether prayer-fellowship with Christians of other denominations is prohibited thereby enters the realm of casuistry, asserts that "there are in the domain of casuistry cases where the question whether unionistic prayer-fellowship is involved cannot be answered in advance."

Surely this statement accepted by Synod cannot in any fair and legitimate way be interpreted as a *retraction* on my part of the charge of false doctrine against Synod, but is, *as actually stated in the Report, a withdrawal of the charge, the withdrawal being understood as in view of the acceptance of my doctrinal statement.* It is likewise evident that this doctrinal statement is not, as Rev. Strieter asserts, a "statement which he [Dr. Brux] and the Committee jointly accepted," as if I had receded from my position and acceded to another, but is, as the Report expressly states ("Dr. Brux states his doctrinal position thus"), my own statement of my own position, to which the Committee and the representatives of the B. F. M. acceded. Compare also the statement of Attorney Otto Rentner on page 13. In view of all this, what shall one think of Rev. Strieter's statement to Dr. Brand that "the Committee (and the various competent pastors and professors with the Committee) had no reason to doubt the sincerity of his retraction"? Is it not a most unbrotherly attempt at insinuation?

2. Rev. Strieter's statement in his par. 2 is apparently meant to imply that I acknowledged making statements which gave the B. F. M. a right to view them as false doctrine. If that should be the implication, this statement of Rev. Strieter is another grievous misrepresentation. In a footnote on p. 97 of *Christian Prayer-Fellowship and Unionism* I had declared with regard to expressions used on pp. 97-99:

"The above reference to refraction of Scripture truths, found also in the mimeographed edition of the paper, has been misunderstood by some. Hence the material added here to show that *the expression is in accord with facts always acknowledged by us.* If the expression should, however, be objectionable, it will be dropped. This holds also for the reference to the gathering of impurities by the water passing through the channel of a brook, on pp. 98, 99."

The false doctrine was thus in the minds of the brethren who read it into my words. Moreover, Rev. Strieter acknowledges in his statement (p. 8) that *in the Report "the words 'which anyone is inclined to interpret' have, of course, the meaning: 'which anyone, on clear and sufficient evidence, is inclined to interpret.'"* Such "clear and sufficient evidence" was never produced by the Board, nor was it produced by the Committee, and it ill becomes Rev. Strieter to interpret my readiness in the interest of peace to drop expressions that brethren may unjustifiably feel to be objectionable as an acknowledgment that they contain false doctrine.

3. In his par. 3 likewise Rev. Strieter is not true to fact. Only one statement, that referred to above on pp. 4 f., was brought to my attention, and rather than believe what the action of the Board seemed to indicate, I accepted the assurance of the representatives of the Board and expressed regret for having stated that offense was *deliberately given*. There was no question that offense was given; I expressed regret for having stated that it was given *deliberately*. In all fairness this statement should not have been put into the Report, because the Committee, seeking to achieve an *amicable settlement* based on doctrinal agreement rather than a *judicial settlement*, *did not undertake an investigation of my charges against the B. F. M. and President Pfotenhauer and demand of them appropriate expressions of regret, and the Committee's use of my statement constitutes a violation of its own declared procedure and an unfair discrimination between the parties concerned.* A committee that has intentionally not investigated the charges preferred against the B. F. M. and President Pfotenhauer has no right to display an isolated expression of regret on my part in a way that

would make it appear that the B. F. M. and President Pfotenhauer are guiltless, and I take the occasion here to protest against such use of my statement by the Chairman of the Committee.

4. Rev. Strieter's statement in his par. 4 has nothing whatever to do with interpretation of the Report accepted at Synod and misrepresents the facts he undertakes to speak of, as any fair-minded reader of *Christian Prayer-Fellowship and Unionism* will discover.

5. In his par. 5 Rev. Strieter gives the impression that the Committee investigated my charges against the B. F. M. and found them to be groundless. Nothing could be farther from the truth. As stated before, the Committee did not even begin to investigate the charges, but proceeded on the mutual understanding that if doctrinal agreement could be achieved, the matter of past procedure could be settled in an amicable way. In the light of this fact the air of judicial virtue assumed by Rev. Strieter becomes him ill. And his vaunted courage to speak the truth fearlessly when it involves synodical officials is damaged beyond recognition by the fact that he executed a strategic about-face as soon as questioned by Dr. Brand concerning the interpretation of the Committee Report (see pp. 8 f.) and lacked even the courage to inform me of what he had written Dr. Brand till over one month and a half later, when it could be withheld no longer (see pp. 20 and 22).

6. What Rev. Strieter in his par. 6 states to be "inconceivable," viz. "that any of those who attended the deliberations can indulge in such criticism" [of the Board's action and its assumption of having been vindicated at Synod], can perhaps best be made conceivable both to Rev. Strieter and to Synod at large through a statement by Attorney Otto Rentner of Chicago, a member of Rev. Strieter's own Committee at Cleveland, which was made by him in Rev. Strieter's presence at a meeting in Chicago on Nov. 7, 1935 (for further information with regard to this meeting see pp. 26-33). According to the minutes of this meeting (pp. 14 f.) Attorney Rentner declared:

"It seems that we are back in the same situation in which the month of June found us. We are again dealing with a lot of technicalities. I said nothing at Synod for a long time. It was a controversy on the interpretation of fellowship-prayer, but I came to the conclusion that unless some amicable adjustment could be made, the matter would not be settled by Synod. If the Report came to the floor of Synod, there would be so much wrangling for which Synod would not find time. Dr. Arndt was making notes in his book. I agreed with his statements as to the futility of going into all details at Cleveland. The Committee then presented one point as a basis to talk about, and they began to get places. A cold resolution by Synod on an affair which was subject to several interpretations, as is the case here, was out of the question. *There is too much ambiguity in the wording of the Committee Report.* There was some discussion about the use of terms used in the Report, e. g., whether Synod should 'recommend' to the Board that Dr. Brux be returned, or whether Synod should 'instruct' the Board to do so. *The word 'instruct' was what was meant, that is my impression; that is what was behind the resolution when the language was used.* We would take care later of the withdrawal of the appeal and take out of the world all controversy officially. That Dr. Brux be permitted to give a statement on the question of prayer-fellowship as part of the resolution was agreed. His eligibility was made with the 'therefore' clause. Dr. Brux' version is correct when he said that this word did refer to the foregoing part, and that on his objection to

it the Committee agreed to drop the word and make it an independent paragraph. The Committee agreed to strike out the word 'therefore' so that this sentence will stand by itself. Both sides had to give something, neither side was going to do all the taking. The Mission Board was to give this that he became eligible for the ministry, Dr. Brux conceding to the Mission Board the withdrawal of his appeal and the charges he had made. This was to take care of Dr. Brux' status. *The status quo was thereby established, involving the necessary implications.* In the following paragraph the word 'recommend' was used instead of the word 'instruct' because the latter was felt to be too strong to be recommended to Synod. *The important thing was that Dr. Brux resume his life's work. The Mission Board members present made the statement that they would return him to the field and that no stronger language was necessary.* Now we are back to the same situation and again confronted with the question whether an amicable adjustment can be made. Charges have again been made. If we wish to get somewhere each side must forget. Since Synod has determined that Dr. Brux is to go back to India, we can iron out the differences as far as the salary question is concerned. *There is no question about the Mission Board's duty, since he was recommended to be returned to the field. Dr. Brux is entitled to back salary, and we ought to tend to it and forget about it.* Let us go ahead, friends, and put him back into the *status quo* and take care of him financially. It is just a question as to whether the Board has done all they could, whether they knew enough about Dr. Brux' situation which would warrant them to give him more, and then let us eliminate everything that came between the synodical session and the present time." [Italics are mine.]

Present at the meeting in Chicago on Nov. 7, 1935, were also the Revs. Dankworth, Maurer, Proehl, and Sievers, all of whom had taken part in the discussions in committee at Cleveland. Their testimony with regard to what had transpired in committee and with respect to the meaning of the Committee's Report is likewise recorded, though imperfectly, in the minutes of this meeting. Said REV. DANKWORTH: "... My impression is that the paper on prayer-fellowship is in suspense and no declaration was made as to whether it was right or wrong. The paper was recommended or referred to conferences for further study. In view of the fact that he [Dr. Brux] is not found guilty of heresy from direct proof from Scripture, therefore he is eligible, thus the Committee declared him eligible for service (p. 19) . . . The issue is: is the whole essay of prayer-fellowship identical with the short statement in the Committee resolution, or is the essay on prayer-fellowship a separate fundamental issue? In the presentation presented by Dr. Brux the issue culminates on correct exegesis. Synod received the essay as a contribution to further study. We must think clearly. This essay was commended to all pastoral conferences. The Board on the basis of the essay adjudged Dr. Brux guilty of heresy. The essay is not considered final but a contribution to discussion. The Committee is convinced he is not a heretic . . . Dr. Brux feels his essay on prayer-fellowship is epitomized in the statement which was adopted as a statement, or does the Board feel that it was rejected? . . . I do not disagree with that statement; I am not ready to say it is heresy. I am inclined to think it correct. If the Board feels the statement is a repudiation of the essay, Scriptural proof must be supplied. If it is a subscription to his essay, then his position was accepted (p. 27). . . . In my mind, as far as the proceedings in Cleveland are concerned, there was entirely too much equivocation, too much of an attempt to gloss things over and to make everybody happy. As a result the language to the one means this and to another it means that. The thing is to

speak point-blank. It was unfortunate that there was an evasion of the real issue. The sooner we brush all other things aside and face the situation squarely, the sooner it will be settled. Not just simply a matter of heresy. Dr. Brux indicated that there is a different interpretation of the Scripture passages. This is a matter of deep concern and a question of conscience. There is some lack of interest in synodical work. This matter is breaking down the morale. Get this difficulty out of the way and build up the morale again. This is merely holding things back (pp. 38 f.). . . . We must be fair and square. There dare not be any more equivocation. Brethren are sore. There must be love. These were all palliatives at Synod. Issue was not directly placed before Synod. Now we must face the issue" (p. 42). REV. MAURER declared: "Dr. Brux did not terminate his call. The charge of heresy against him was not proven. The Board could not terminate his call without a just charge. The words of the settlement must be regarded as an adjustment. Those words can only mean the *status quo* in the entire affair. The B. F. M. was repudiated. You folks caused the situation that there was a lack of [money for] salary. The settlement of Synod was so accepted. How can there be a settlement without a financial settlement, a settlement with no salary? The action is shocking after Synod has spoken. That the F. M. B. will come to such a position as to state 'there is no relation,' 'he is not on salary,' that certainly was not the interpretation of the settlement. Synod spoke clearly and restored the original position of Dr. Brux. He is to return to the field . . . Who gave Dr. Brand authority to resign him from our employ? Who gave Dr. Brand authority to state that he is not in our employ? . . . When Synod upheld the man, is a further test by another man necessary? Everything relative to his status was established by the action of Synod; Synod established the relation. Dr. Brand was not to establish this (p. 12) . . . Would not say that Dr. Brux did not sympathize with the Board. Dr. Brux did all he could; but the heresy charged must have good backing; the charge was not supported by Scripture; if the brethren came with pleas on the basis of Scripture, but this was always smiled aside. What was Dr. Brux to do? The man was deprived of salary for four years. This was not justified. As to the letter of Dr. Brand, I would be ashamed to sign my name to that letter.* . . . Is the letter of Director Brand the answer of the B. F. M.? Is that keeping good faith? . . . Did not the Cleveland convention demand that [payment of salary] (p. 17)? . . . The theological question was settled by Synod, it was recommended to the pastoral conferences for further study. By what authority does Dr. Brand again take up the matter (p. 19)? . . . This matter has undermined the confidence of the men in Synod. There is a great deal of resentment felt by a larger number of men than is generally guessed at, and the resentment will be cherished until the matter is settled. It is felt there is no real doctrinal difference to amount to anything. It is merely a personal quarrel between Director Brand and Dr. Brux, and the doctrinal matter is brought in to carry on a personal quarrel. He is in agreement with us on doctrine . . . Synod adopted his position . . . After the settlement has been ordered by Synod, Director Brand has no right to bring it up . . . The actions of the officials are under scrutiny. You are going to have what you feared in Cleveland. This is not a threat, only a prediction (p. 26)." REV. PROEHL remarked: "The call of Dr. Brux . . . does the F. M. B. take the attitude that he is now not in the mission service? The statement of eligibility reaffirms the status Dr. Brux had. It was not a matter of mere eligibility, he was an employee of the Mission Board and according to Christian love there was also a financial obligation" (pp.

*Dr. Brand's letter of July 8, 1935, given on pp. 17 f.

4 and 15 f.). REV. SIEVERS stated: "One thing I wish to ask the B. F. M., how it is come about to deny Dr. Brux a regular income since his re-establishment makes it necessary that his salary begin July 1. When Synod upheld Dr. Brux' case, how can the F. M. B. say that he is not on the salary list even if the doctor's report was [should be: had been] negative . . . What was the procedure of the Board, they had hoped to place him on salary list July 1? In his own heart he [Dr. Arndt] must admit Synod has an obligation. Synod reinstated Dr. Brux as a missionary on furlough and he is entitled to a salary (p. 9) . . . I am apprehensive whether the Report of the Committee was definitely realized as being a compromise between the differences of the Committee of Synod and Dr. Brux. That is my impression. In view of the fact that Synod accepted the statement of the doctrinal position of Dr. Brux, for the thesis is an epitome of the essay on prayer-fellowship and never was anything else. 'We are unanimous in the ideas on unionism and prayer-fellowship,' that is the wording of the resolution; but regardless, he is reinstated in the status of a missionary in the field. Members of the B. F. M. take the attitude that he is not completely exonerated; as though Dr. Brux must give a complete *pater peccavi*. The Report repudiates the action of the F. M. B. I cannot understand it. I informed the best members in my congregation, and they are at sea. How can the F. M. B. dismiss a man without proving that he is wrong? He has asked the F. M. B. to come with proofs, and they have not done it to this day. Our conference considered Dr. Brux' essay on prayer-fellowship, no proof brought to this day. Synod in its resolution repudiates the F. M. B. and I cannot see anything else but that Dr. Brux is reinstated (pp. 16 f.)."

Surely, it is highly significant that there is such substantial agreement between the statement of Attorney Otto Rentner, a member of the Committee at Cleveland, and the statements of brethren who took part in the discussions of the Committee, and that this unanimity is on the very points that Rev. Strieter, the Chairman of the Committee, later, in his letter of July 30 to Dr. Brand, attempted to deny.

But not only the testimony of these brethren who took part in the discussions of the Committee is available; the Report itself, in spite of its inadequate and equivocal wording, is still definite enough to permit any careful reader to elicit the salient facts. In illustration and proof of this I quote here an unsolicited statement by Rev. Speckhard, who was not at Cleveland but studied the Report for himself:

"This is the way I, a member of Synod, interpret the resolutions of Synod on the Brux case:

"1. Since in these resolutions exception is taken to various expressions in Dr. Brux' paper and satisfactory explanations of those expressions are made by him, it follows that the paper as a whole is accepted by Synod, for one does not take exception to individual statements in a paper if one means to reject the whole paper. Therefore I take the resolution to mean, as they also imply, that Dr. Brux' paper is accepted as a first, not final, contribution to the study of prayer-fellowship.

"2. Since these resolutions state: 'Dr. Brux states his doctrinal position thus,' and no other qualifying remark is made, the plain inference of the words is that this has always been Dr. Brux' position, now stated in a single clear and unmistakable sentence. If this statement of his position was to be a retraction of his former position or a new and modified position arrived at after the committee discussions at Cleveland, then the resolutions would have had to say: 'Brux *now* states his doctrinal position thus,' or would have had to use some other qualifying expressions. The simple statement as given

would, to the mind of any third party not attending the discussion, communicate the meaning: this has always been Dr. Brux' stand, now briefly given in simple, clear language, so that all may comprehend.

"3. That the statement of Dr. Brux' position as given by him in the resolutions is not a retraction is evident again from the first point made above. For if his paper as a whole stands, with the exceptions taken corrected, then his position on prayer-fellowship stands as given in the paper, for none of those exceptions had reference to his position on prayer-fellowship. But if his position on prayer-fellowship as given in his paper stands, then the statement of his position on prayer-fellowship as given in par. 3 of the resolutions cannot be interpreted as a retraction of his position on prayer-fellowship as given in his paper. If it is so interpreted, you have this anomalous situation that in one part of the resolutions his position on prayer-fellowship is accepted and in another part it is retracted.

"4. The simple statement without any qualification: 'We hold Dr. Brux eligible for the ministry,' again indicates that no retraction on his part was understood. If his statement was to be understood as a retraction, this conclusive sentence would have had to read: 'Since Dr. Brux retracted his position on prayer-fellowship, we hold etc.'"

This, then, concludes my rejoinder to Rev. Strieter's "interpretation" of the Report to Dr. Brand under date of July 30, 1935."

I shall now return to the narrative of events after the Cleveland convention and relate what transpired between the **B. F. M. and myself.**

II

VIOLATION BY DR. BRAND AND THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS OF THE SETTLEMENT EFFECTED AT SYNOD, WHEREBY SYNOD'S RESOLUTION HAS VIRTUALLY BEEN SET ASIDE

Under date of July 1, 1935, Dr. Brand requested me and the family to undergo "a complete medical examination." In my reply of July 3 I stated that we were considering the choice of a doctor in Racine, and added:

"No doubt you realize that I must know definitely at once what my present status is with respect to salary. Am I now on salary or not? In case the medical examination should result—contrary to our hopes—in an unfavorable verdict, will I be on salary until I shall have obtained a call here in the States? Please give me a clear reply to each of these two questions. Each day of delay may deprive the family and myself of necessary earnings."

On July 8 I reported further:

"Last Friday and Saturday we visited Dr. C. F. Browne in several 'shifts' and underwent physical examination. The results were gratifying. We were all found to be physically sound."

On this same day, July 8, Dr. Brand reported the resolution adopted by the Board in its meeting of July 6 thus:

"I submitted your letter of July 3, 1935, to the Board. In answer to your two questions I was instructed to write you:

- 1) that you are not on the salary of the Board;
- 2) that you will not be on salary of the Board until you shall have obtained a call here in the States — in case the medical examinations to which we asked you and your family to submit should result in an unfavorable verdict;
- 3) that a one-time grant of \$150 be made to you which will reach you as soon as we can get the money from the Fiscal Office.

"Since you asked for a 'clear reply to each of the two questions,' we trust the foregoing will be satisfactory."

On July 11 Dr. Brand wrote: "I am happy to write that Dr. Browne's findings are altogether favorable. I shall not fail to submit his report to the Board at the very next opportunity."

Under date of July 13 Dr. Brand mailed the "one-time grant" referred to in his letter of July 8. Receipt was acknowledged by card on July 15, with the statement added: "A letter will follow." For I hoped that receipt by Dr. Brand of the physician's report would alter his and the Board's attitude as expressed in his letter of July 8. However, no further communication from Dr. Brand reached me within the next ten days. On July 26 I therefore inquired by card: "I am waiting to learn what action the Board has taken with respect to me and my return to India. May I have an early reply?" In his reply of July 20 Dr. Brand wrote of efforts made by the B. F. M. to procure "future salary and travelling expenses to India" and expressed his regret that he is "not in a position to give a more definite answer." Again, in his letter of Aug. 14, Dr. Brand stated: "It is manifest that the B. F. M. will have to await the action of the Board of Directors."

The negative attitude displayed in Dr. Brand's letter of July 8 and the subsequent failure of the Board to alter its attitude even after having received a favorable medical report with regard to our health and ability to return to India constrained me, for the time being, to accept a position at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago which had been offered me *after* the Board had taken the negative attitude reported in Dr. Brand's letter of July 8. I moved to Chicago at the end of July and took up work at the Oriental Institute on Aug. 1.

On Sept. 2 Dr. Brand called at my home in Chicago and informed me that the Board had been able to obtain funds and was now ready to return me to the field, next month if possible. To his question whether I was ready to go I replied that this depended on the attitude and action of the Board, and inquired what the Board had decided in regard to salary, including back salary for the period from Dec. 1, 1932, to June 30, 1935. Dr. Brand said that with respect to the former the Board had agreed on a salary such as I would receive if I had not been dismissed, but that with respect to the latter it has refused to make a settlement. "Do you hold," he asked, "that the B. F. M. and the S. Wis. District were in error in their action against you?" I said: "I do," and on Dr. Brand's request gave my reasons. Dr. Brand then asked me to state these reasons in writing to the Board. I agreed to do so if a written request were made. This ended the visit.

In a letter of Sept. 3 Dr. Brand wrote: "I am very anxious to understand your present position fully as you outlined it to me yesterday. Would it trouble you too much to let me have it again as succinctly and clearly as you can put it into a few words?" My reply was the following letter of Sept. 8 to the Board:

"Dear Brethren:

"At the close of his visit here on Sept. 2, and again in his letter of Sept. 3, Dr. Brand requested me to write a statement with respect to my understanding of the Committee Report on our case adopted by Synod.

"As I pointed out to Dr. Brand on his visit here on Sept. 2, my understanding of the Committee Report is that of the Committee itself as reported to me by the Chairman of the Committee, Rev. Strieter, to wit:

"The statement, 'Dr. Brux states that he withdraws his appeal,' is to be understood as withdrawal *in view of the amicable settlement reached in the Committee*. (The settlement involved the upholding of my eligibility, the instruction, resp. recommendation, by Synod to the B. F. M. to return me to

India, and the promise given by Dr. Arndt and Rev. Kretzschmar, as spokesmen for the B. F. M., to fulfill toward me what Christian love and fairness would require, adding that the brethren present could hold them to the promise if the Board failed to perform it. This promise was understood by me and by brethren present to imply proper reimbursement for the time during which I had been held dismissed by the Board.)*

"2. The statement, 'He withdraws the charge of false doctrine against Synod,' is to be understood as withdrawal *in view of the acceptance of my position on prayer-fellowship, which is stated briefly in par. 3 of the Committee Report.*

"3. The words of par. 4 of the Report, 'which anyone is inclined to interpret as being unscriptural,' are to be understood in the sense: 'which any one, *on clear and sufficient evidence*, is inclined to interpret, etc.'

"I had no hand in drawing up the final wording of the Committee Report, which altered considerably the draft to which I had agreed; a member of the B. F. M., however, did have a hand in it.

"When the Committee Report in its final form was submitted to me for perusal on the morning of June 26, shortly before we entered the session in which the Report was read, I requested the insertion of the words 'in view of the amicable settlement reached in the Committee' and 'in view of the acceptance of the doctrinal statement on prayer-fellowship,' but was told by the Chairman and another member of the Committee present that there was no time to make the change and that the words, as they stand, are meant by the Committee to be understood thus. However, at the suggestion of the other member of the Committee, the word 'therefore' before 'we hold Bro. Brux eligible for the ministry' was dropped by the Committee. During the noon recess of that day I spoke to Rev. Strieter again and inquired if, in case I should be asked to state the meaning of the Report, I would be justified in putting the interpretation given above on the words of the Committee Report and in giving it as the meaning of the Committee, and he said that I would be justified.

"Seeing a danger in the unsatisfactory reproduction of my statements in the Committee Report, I requested Rev. Strieter a few days after Synod to have added to the printed Proceedings a footnote which would prevent a misunderstanding of the statements in question. Rev. Strieter submitted the following signed statement to the Secretary of Synod with the request that it be printed as an explanatory footnote to the Committee Report.

"In drawing up this Report the Committee sought to be brief. Dr. Brux felt that some statements were really too brief and that, in order to avoid any misunderstanding of his statements, he preferred the following reading: "In view of the settlement reached in the Committee, Dr. Brux withdraws his appeal and expresses regret for the publication of any subjective judgments. In view of full agreement on the following doctrinal statement with respect to prayer-fellowship, he also withdraws the charge of false doctrine against Synod."—The words "which anyone is inclined to interpret" have, of course, the meaning: "which anyone, on clear and sufficient evidence, is inclined to interpret."—T. W. Strieter, Chairman."

"I trust it will be clear from the above that my understanding of the statements of the Committee Report is that of the Committee as reported to me by the Chairman of the Committee.

*On this last point see the statement by Attorney Otto Rentner on p. 14.

"Furthermore, it appears to me that the interpretation given above is the only one that is consistent with my doctrinal statement on prayer-fellowship embodied in the Committee Report. The position defined there is the position I had set forth in my conference paper in India in 1924, in the revised and enlarged paper submitted to the Board in 1931, and in the printed paper issued in June of this year (1935). I pointed this out repeatedly in the Committee, and in the first draft of agreement the statement had been inserted: 'He [Dr. Brux] states that this has always been his doctrinal position.' There can, therefore, have been no misunderstanding with respect to my continuing to hold the position set forth in my paper, and anyone may see from the paper itself that the doctrinal statement embodied in the Committee Report is in every essential that set forth in the paper. This doctrinal statement having been accepted by the Committee, it follows of necessity that I have been exonerated and that my withdrawal of the charge of false doctrine was *in view of the acceptance of this doctrinal statement by the Committee* and that my withdrawal of the appeal was *in view of the amicable settlement reached in the Committee*. It likewise follows that the B. F. M. erred in dismissing me in 1932 and that the S. Wis. District erred in sustaining its President in his refusal to uphold by eligibility. However, as I pointed out to Dr. Brand on Sept. 2, the important matter for Synod and for all concerned is the doctrinal agreement, not the verdict 'guilty' or 'acquitted,' and for this reason I did not insist on a definite declaration of guilt or exoneration in the Committee Report.

"I am, accordingly, greatly surprised at the interpretation which the Board now endeavors to put on the statements of the Committee Report and at the refusal of the Board (as reported to me by Dr. Brand on Sept. 2) to reimburse me for the time during which the Board had dismissed me from service. Surely, the interpretation of the Committee Report given by the Chairman of the Committee, speaking for the Committee, should be the official interpretation, and the promises given by the spokesmen for the B. F. M. in the committee sessions should be honored by the Board and redeemed. When after acceptance of the Committee Report by Synod several brethren were contemplating to bring the matter of reimbursement on the floor of Synod for definite settlement, Dr. Arndt counseled against it and asked that the matter be left to the Board, giving the assurance that he would urge favorable action in the matter by the Board.

"In this connection I would also express to the Board my surprise at the reply given by the Board (letter of Dr. Brand dated July 8) to my question whether or not I am now on salary. At Cleveland, after adoption of the Committee Report, I was definitely given to understand by Dr. Arndt, who had in a special meeting consulted the members of the Board present at Synod, that my salary would begin as of July 1. The reply of the Board under date of July 8 states: 'You are not on the salary of the Board.' I kindly request an explanation of this, as also of the reason for refusing to reimburse me for the time the Board had dismissed me."

A copy of this letter was sent to Dr. Arndt and to Rev. Strieter.

It must be pointed out here that I had not up to this time been informed by Rev. Strieter of the "interpretation" of the Committee Report given by him to Dr. Brand, nor had Dr. Brand or the Board mentioned that they had been given an interpretation of the Report different from that which I had received from Rev. Strieter. This matter was kept secret.

Concerned over the manner in which the matter was developing, I wrote Rev. Strieter on Sept. 15 as follows:

"My letter of Sept. 8 to the B. F. M., of which I sent you a copy, will no doubt have led you to see that it is possible that the Board, or at least Dr. Brand, may endeavor to resume the same attitude taken toward me in 1932. In his letter of Sept. 3 Dr. Brand desired to know in particular whether I hold that the B. F. M. and the S. Wis. District erred in their action against me. This point had come up when I inquired of Dr. Brand what the Board had resolved with respect to reimbursement for 1932-1935. If I be not mistaken in the impression received from Dr. Brand's conversation and in the inference drawn from the question asked in his letter of Sept. 3, Dr. Brand's position—and perhaps that of the Board also—is that if I hold that the B. F. M. and the S. Wis. District erred, I will be out, because the Board will take the former attitude again and will probably prevail on the officials of the S. Wis. District to follow suit. The eligibility of a missionary for foreign service seems to be dependent not on scriptural teaching, but on whether he will regard the B. F. M. and its General Secretary as infallible.

"These developments indicate that the work of your Committee at Synod is in danger of being undone, and that the resolutions incorporated in the Report are in danger of being set aside by the Board in a way similar to that in which the report of the Confidential Committee (Daib-Dau-Laetsch) was set aside in 1933. The present trouble seems to be due largely to the fact that the Board fails to find in the Report of the Committee a direct verdict containing the words 'guilty' or 'acquitted.' The direct verdict of the Committee, 'We hold Bro. Brux to be eligible for the ministry,' is apparently overlooked. And apart from this, any person acquainted with the position on prayer-fellowship hitherto held by Synod will be able to see that the position accepted at Synod in the Committee Report is not the old "accepted" position, but the position I have been advocating since 1924, and will also be able to infer who was 'guilty' and who was 'vindicated.' But the Board is apparently not interested in drawing the necessary inference.

"The situation therefore seems to call for some definite action on your part, as Chairman of the Committee, viz., for a clear statement by you to the B. F. M. as to how the Committee itself understood the statements of its Report. For when a committee report is interpreted differently by different parties, it is only fair that the committee itself, respectively the committee chairman, be given opportunity to interpret the report as understood by the committee. And if one of the parties involved in a controversy insists on putting its own interpretation on a committee report, it would appear to be the duty of the committee or of its chairman to state clearly how the committee understood its report.

"In my letter to the Board dated Sept. 8 I gave the interpretation of the Committee Report which you had given me on June 26, the day on which the Report was read and adopted, and which you had stated I would have a right to give as the understanding of the Committee. From what was said and done in the committee sessions, from the wording of the first draft of the Report, and from the dropping of the word 'therefore' before 'we hold Bro. Brux eligible for the ministry,' I cannot but believe that your interpretation as given me on that day is in keeping with the facts, and also that it clearly implies that the B. F. M. erred in dismissing me in 1932 and that the S. Wis. District erred in sustaining its President in his refusal to uphold my eligibility. That on the basis of this interpretation the Board would owe me reimbursement for 1932-1935 is such a plain matter of Christian ethics that Christians ought not to argue over it.

"It is to be regretted that the Secretary of Synod was not permitted by the President of Synod to add to the Committee Report the footnote which you had submitted. It may be too late now to do so, unless it be printed on slips and pasted in the Proceedings. But I am certainly not satisfied with the decision of the officials of Synod; for the footnote would merely give me an opportunity to interpret my own statements in a case where there is grave possibility of misunderstanding them, and the request for such a footnote should in all fairness be granted. Just what my next step will be will depend in a measure on what you will find it possible to do in the present situation brought on by the attitude of the B. F. M. and its private interpretation of the Committee Report.

"I do not wish to view matters pessimistically, but, like Patrick Henry, we have no way of judging the future except by the past, and in the light of the past the present occurrences certainly constitute a grave danger that the B. F. M. may set the Committee Report aside and the entire controversy may be reopened. If this is to be prevented, quick and firm action will be needed."

In his reply of Sept. 18 Rev. Strieter finally informed me of what he had written to Dr. Brand in reply to the latter's request for an interpretation (see pp. 8 f.), though the date on which he had written (July 30, 1935) became known to me only on receipt of his letter of Oct. 7, in which he inclosed, at my request, a copy of the correspondence between Dr. Brand and himself. In his letter of Sept. 18 Rev. Strieter stated that if I insist on using his footnote as I had indicated in my letter to the Board of Sept. 8, his "signature is then herewith withdrawn." As if such withdrawal of signature at this late date were possible! Furthermore, he failed to enlighten me in what other meaning I or any reader could have understood his footnote.

In a letter to me of Sept. 17 Dr. Arndt inclosed a memorandum which he had submitted to the Board with respect to my letter of Sept. 8. In this memorandum Dr. Arndt sought to justify his and the Board's action. In order that Synod may judge how sadly facts, promises, and Lutheran principles suffered in the process, I subjoin to the memorandum my own corrective remarks. Dr. Arndt's memorandum reads:

"The following points I consider important:

"1. Whether or not the Strieter Committee Report was altered, as Dr. Brux complains, I do not know. As far as I can remember, nobody showed me the Committee Report with the remark: 'This is the final revision which will be presented to the convention.'

"2. It is true that Dr. Brux at Cleveland, after the Strieter Committee Report had been adopted, approached me with respect to the salary that he did not receive since Dec. 1, 1932. He asked me whether I would be willing to bring this subject before the convention. I positively refused. To the best of my recollection I stated, 'If others wish to submit this question to the assembly, let them take this course on their own responsibility. I shall have nothing to do with it.' I think Dr. Brux is right when he says that I counseled against the idea.

"3. There never arose in my mind, as far as I can remember, the thought that we ought to pay Dr. Brux the full salary which he would have received from Dec. 1, 1932, till July, 1935, if he had remained in our service. I cannot recall that I ever entertained such a plan. But what impressed me was that he has contracted a debt amounting to fifteen hundred dollars, and I was

hoping that ways might be found of assisting him in paying this debt. I have no doubt that I mentioned these reflections to him. With some of the brethren I discussed them at some length. What he says about assurances of Christian love and fairness is correct.

"4. I do not recall that in the meetings of the Strieter Committee at Cleveland any member of the Committee stated that the Board had erred in dismissing Dr. Brux in 1932 and that hence he is entitled to his salary between that date and the present time. It may be, however, that Dr. Brux himself in the committee meetings made this statement.

"5. At Cleveland it was our hope that Dr. Brux could without difficulty again be placed on the list of our missionaries and that his salary might begin with July. It developed afterwards that first the Board of Directors would have to be consulted, so that the increased expenditure might not wreck our budget for the present year. It was always understood, of course, that whatever statements we members of the Board attending the Cleveland convention made were subject to the approval of the Board. We were fully conscious of being able merely to state our own opinions, and I am sure did not hesitate to say so.

"6. Since the Cleveland convention my aim has been to help in reinstating Dr. Brux as our missionary. The matter of liquidating his debt I considered one that might be taken care of later, after the chief objective had been attained. For this reason I have not at our Board meetings said much about the debt of Dr. Brux and have refrained from urging that the Board discuss what could be done about it.

"7. As to the doctrinal question at issue, I have no doubt that misunderstandings crept in now and then. I know, at least, that I myself at Cleveland one evening totally misunderstood Dr. Brux, as I found out when the same subject was touched on again the following day. Other brethren may have had the same experience. I cannot find fault with the statement of Dr. Brux' position on prayer-fellowship as embodied in the Committee Report. It seems very plain to me, however, that there are statements in his essay as submitted to us in 1932 which are inconsistent with what the Committee Report gives as his position.

"8. That Dr. Brux could not be returned to India as a missionary of the Missouri Synod while holding and saying that the Missouri Synod is guilty of wrong teaching should be plain to every one. Surely in this respect the course of the Board requires no lengthy justification.—W. Arndt."

My remarks follow (the paragraphs correspond to those of Dr. Arndt's memorandum):

1. Surely, it was not necessary to present the final wording to one who, as I was told (see pp. 5 and 7), was present in the executive session of the Committee and had helped in phrasing the Report.

2. It must be remembered that the promise given by Dr. Arndt and Rev. Kretzschmar, the representatives of the Board, that the Board would do all that Christian love and fairness would require, also in a financial way, was understood, in the light of the discussions in committee and of the statements agreed on in the Report, to include payment of back salary, and hence this matter was not discussed further in committee. That it was not mentioned in the Report is unfortunate. *The understanding, however, was that this matter be taken care of as a separate item apart from the Report.* For this reason I did not approach Dr. Arndt concerning the matter until after the Report had been adopted. The

conviction that the Board was in Christian duty and fairness bound to pay back salary was held also by members of the Committee, as is clear from Attorney Rentner's statement (pp. 13 f.): "The Mission Board was to give this that he become eligible for the ministry, Dr. Brux conceding to the Mission Board the withdrawal of his appeal and the charges he had made. This was to take care of Dr. Brux' status. The *status quo* was thereby established, *involving the necessary implications*. . . . There is no question about the Mission Board's duty, since he was recommended to be returned to the field. *Dr. Brux is entitled to back salary, and we ought to tend to it and forget about it.*" This conviction was shared also by the Revs. Dankworth, Maurer, Proehl, and Sievers, as is evident from their declarations (see pp. 14-16). It is true that Dr. Arndt refused to bring the question of payment of back salary before the convention. However, Dr. Arndt failed to mention in his memorandum that when other brethren spoke to him about this same matter he advised them not to do this, but on the contrary to write the Board concerning this matter and urge the Board to take the matter up, *promising them to support their pleas before the Board*. Why was the Board not apprised of these facts? And why did Dr. Arndt not redeem his promise when these brethren wrote and pleaded as he had suggested?

3. The first sentence is significant. Dr. Arndt does not deny that he did have in his mind to pay back salary, he denies only that he thought the Board should pay "the full salary which he would have received from Dec. 1, 1932, till July, 1935." This latter is due to the fact that I had not requested payment of full salary, but had told Dr. Arndt and the brethren interested in these negotiations that I would waive payment of approximately one half of what was due. It is significant, too, that Dr. Arndt admits having discussed with some brethren payment of an amount sufficient at least to cover the indebtedness incurred from Dec., 1932, to June, 1935, and his assurances of Christian love and fairness.

4. There is good reason why neither the Committee nor any of its members stated that "the Board had erred in dismissing Dr. Brux in 1932 and that hence he is entitled to his salary between that date and the present time." The Committee sought an *amicable*, not a *judicial* settlement and *on purpose refrained from any direct declaration of guilt*. The conviction of individual members of the Committee is, however, well illustrated in the declaration of Attorney Otto Rentner given above under 2.

Points 5-8 in Dr. Arndt's memorandum were taken up by me in the following rejoinder to his memorandum which I sent to the Board under date of Sept. 30:

"Confining myself to what are at present the most important items in the memorandum, I would point out the following:

"1. Par. 5 does not explain the negative attitude taken by the Board in its letter to me under date of July 8. If the Board of Directors and the Fiscal Conference stood in the way of immediate payment of salary, why was this not mentioned? Was not provision of the necessities of life till our actual departure for India part of the assurance of Christian love and fairness given by you and Rev. Kretzschmar in the final session of the Committee at Synod? Shall I be forced to conclude that the promise was given merely to induce me to agree to a settlement and to withdrawal of the appeal and was to be made invalid soon after by the plea that all promises made by the representatives of the Board were subject to the approval of the B. F. M.? *A promise given in committee and forming part of the settlement achieved there and approved by Synod certainly can not be said to be any longer subject to the approval or disapproval of the B. F. M. The Board is either bound to*

honor the promise fully, or by its refusal to do so it will invalidate the settlement of which it formed a part and throw it overboard. Failure on the part of the B. F. M. during the past three months to redeem the promise given at Synod, or even to make adequate efforts to redeem it in its various aspects, constrains me to believe that the latter has occurred.

"2. Your statements in par. 6 seem to indicate that there is no particular interest on your part to carry out your promise. Indefinite postponement, as you well know, simply means forgetting the matter and letting it die. Certainly, such indefinite postponement is not in keeping with the assurance of fair and brotherly dealing given me by you in committee at Synod.

"3. If misunderstandings crept in with respect to the doctrinal questions at issue, as you allege in par. 7, it can hardly have been because I did not state my position clearly. You will remember that when on June 23 my doctrinal statement was first agreed to by you and the rest of the members of the private committee working together with the Chairman of Committee 22B, I stated repeatedly that the position agreed on is the one I had advocated since 1924 and set forth in my paper. You stated to my great surprise that you thought it was Synod's position.* I denied this and pointed out the differences. I was not shown then that this was Synod's position, nor was I shown on several subsequent occasions when I repeated the statement in committee sessions that this has always been the position advocated and defended by me over against the "accepted" position of Synod. In fact, the statement, 'He [Dr. Brux] states that this has always been his doctrinal position,' (namely, since the beginning of the controversy in 1924) was even incorporated in the first draft of the Committee Report. Why was I not shown to be in error if you were in a position to do so? Even now you repeat the charge that my doctrinal statement in the Committee Report differs from the position held by me since 1924 and set forth in my paper, but you bring no evidence in proof of it. *I challenge you to submit proof of your statement.*†

"4. The position taken in par. 8 is surprising. In the resolution adopted by the Board on Oct. 12, 1932, **the Board gave as its reason for dismissing me not my challenge of the correctness of Synod's position, or, as the Board prefers to put it, my charge of false teaching on the part of Synod, but the error allegedly held by me with respect to prayer-fellowship and charged against me by the Board.** The resolution states: 'Since Dr. Brux in his paper on "Prayer-Fellowship" has departed from the accepted Scriptural position of our Synod with respect to prayer with Christians, as he himself acknowledges, and since our long continued efforts to convince him of the error of his position have been unavailing, **RESOLVED** that we cannot return him to the field in India if he does not recede from his position within the time stated in his remarks as given in the minutes.' To justify this resolution and its execution it will certainly not do to plead at this late hour that 'Dr. Brux could not be returned to India as a missionary of the Missouri Synod while holding and saying that the Missouri Synod is guilty of wrong teaching.' The resolution and its execution by the Board can be justified only by *actually proving me guilty of doctrinal error in the matter of prayer-fellowship with heterodox Christians.* I must therefore protest against the unfairness involved in the attempted shift of the cause for my dismissal on the part of

*I. e., as interpreted up to that time by the B. F. M. and Dr. Pfotenhauer.

†The challenge has not to date been accepted. Dr. Arndt appears not to be interested in proving charges which he raises against a brother (see pp. 37-45).

the Board. The reason for the attempted shift is obvious. Having failed to prove me guilty of doctrinal error with respect to prayer-fellowship and thus to justify the Board's resolution and action, it is found necessary now to make it appear that it wasn't at all the charge of error against me which led the Board to dismiss me, but merely my challenge of the correctness of Synod's position! Is such maneuvering worthy of Christian men?

"Besides, the principle enunciated in par. 8 is thoroughly un-Lutheran. This principle makes it impossible, except on pain of dismissal from office, for a pastor of Synod to challenge the correctness of Synod's "accepted" doctrine and practice in matters that do not involve the fundamentals of Christianity. Lutheran principle, however, gives to every pastor, nay to every church member, the right and the duty to call attention to error in doctrine and practice when such appear, and imposes on the church the duty of either proving the Scripturalness of its accepted position and the error of the opposing view, or of accepting the correction proposed; but never does it give to the church (resp. Synod) the right to dismiss a pastor merely because the pastor challenges the correctness of a given position when that challenge does not involve one of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. The principle with which it is sought to justify the action of the Board merely assumes that all of Synod's accepted positions are infallibly correct. Otherwise it would have to be granted that, in cases where the fundamental doctrines of our Christian faith are not involved, a pastor who challenges the correctness of one of Synod's "accepted" positions may remain in office until the issue has been settled satisfactorily. I am really alarmed at the principle set forth by the Board, because *it is destructive of the very liberty won for our church by Luther*. I am equally amazed at the assumption that all members of Synod will accept the principle without further demand for justification. Have we really arrived at the point where a pastor dare not open his mouth against "accepted" positions in Synod on nonfundamentals without incurring dismissal?"

Dr. Arndt's memorandum convinced me, as it will no doubt convince Synod also, that the Board's failure to redeem the promises given by its representatives at Synod was due not to the Board of Directors and synodical red tape, but, among other things, to *the Board's unwarranted assumption that the promises given by its representatives at Synod were still subject to its approval or disapproval and that in spite of acceptance of the Report by Synod the Board might construe the stipulations of the Report in its own interest* (though in violation of the wording of the Report as meant by the Committee and as implied in the wording itself). It showed furthermore, by the Board's maneuvering away from the reasons given for my dismissal in its own resolution of Oct. 12, 1932, to the new position that a mere challenge of the Scripturalness of an "accepted" position by a missionary entitles the Board to dismiss him, that arguing with a Board holding such an unfair and unscriptural principle is futile and that recourse to a higher authority is unavoidable. I therefore wrote on the same day, Sept. 30, 1935, the letter to Pres. Behnken given above on p. 2, in which I declared my intention to re-appeal the case. the case.

III

MEETING OF NOVEMBER 7, 1935, IN CHICAGO

My letter to Pres. Behnken resulted in a meeting called by him for Nov. 7, 1935, at the Morrison Hotel, Chicago. Pres. Behnken had invited Dr. Pfotenhauer, Dr. Arndt, Vice-Pres. Kretschmar, Mr. G. Schmidt of St. Louis, and Rev. T. W.

Strieter, Chairman of the Committee in Cleveland. However, other brethren who had taken part in the discussions in committee at Cleveland, including even a member of the Committee itself, were available, and of these I asked the Revs. Dankworth, Maurer, Proehl, Sievers, and Attorney Otto Rentner to appear likewise. Rev. Dankworth was chosen temporary secretary. *A stenographic secretary was denied*, and Rev. Theo. Dorn was asked to serve as secretary instead. I protested against this in the following statement incorporated in the minutes:

"Since my request for a stenographic secretary able to take down a verbatim report has been denied, and since this has been done even though such a secretary had been made available and was standing at the door, I feel constrained to register my protest against the denial of such a secretary as being inherently unfair, because in cases of controversy in the church it is as necessary to have an accurate verbatim report as in our civil courts, and [such] ought to be provided as a matter of course, without special request. When repeated requests for a competent stenographic secretary have been denied, as has now happened twice in my case, and when the denial is made on such grounds as embarrassment or need to watch one's words, it condemns itself as unfair. Furthermore, the secretary now called, who is admittedly not able to take down a verbatim report, has been called after the resolution to have a stenographer was passed, and without having rescinded the resolution. I protest also against such procedure."

Rev. Dorn then proceeded to make a record of the proceedings in longhand. Rev. Dankworth was also asked to continue as secretary. The minutes written by Rev. Dorn were mailed to me under date of Feb. 27, 1936. In a statement "to whom it may concern," which accompanies the minutes, Rev. Dorn confessed with commendable honesty:

"Herewith the proceedings of the meeting spread upon the following pages are humbly submitted with an oppressive sense of their many shortcomings. Never has the undersigned been so depressed over a task which at the very outset appeared difficult. Uncounted hours of time which might have been used for the work of the gospel were instead consumed by this task.

"May the undersigned make the following request to all those concerned: Please exercise charity towards the secretary. Do unto others as you would have others do unto you.

"Language was sacrificed for the sake of fidelity to brachylogical notes. A word for word recording was attempted, and because of this effort some statements, remarks of tremendous value, may have been omitted.

"My ardent prayer to God with respect to these minutes is: May God grant that no one will be falsely accused because of any error on the part of the secretary."*

In spite of the shortcomings of the minutes taken under the circumstances referred to, a number of very important facts have nevertheless been brought out clearly. To some of them reference has already been made (see pp. 5 and 13-16).

*Is such a statement from a secretary called to serve in place of a stenographic secretary who had been refused not sufficient ground for Synod henceforth to make a stenographic record obligatory when requested by one of the parties in a controversy with synodical officials? Or is the "embarrassment" which synodical officials fear for themselves to be accounted of greater importance and worthy of more consideration than the cause of justice and truth?

Rev. Dorn's fears with regard to the minutes were not unfounded. Some important statements are omitted, numerous statements are badly garbled, serious misstatements occur, and in some cases, due to the secretary's "brachylogical notes," a speaker is reported as saying the opposite of what he said. I do not hold Rev. Dorn responsible for this. He conscientiously did what he could under the circumstances. The blame attaches to those who denied the request for a stenographic secretary.

Others will be sketched in the following narrative based on the minutes:*

To the charges raised in my letter of re-appeal (see p. 2) Dr. Arndt, on behalf of the B. F. M., gave a lengthy account of the efforts which it alleges to have made to carry out the Cleveland resolution. But search the account as one may, there is, apart from the "one-time grant" of \$150.00, no mention whatever of any effort to provide for maintenance from July 1, 1935, till our return to India. The pleas to the Board of Directors are all for funds for 1936-37, none for 1935.† When the question was asked "how it is come about to deny Dr. Brux a regular income since his re-establishment makes it necessary that his salary begin July 1," Dr. Arndt replied: "Synod did not tell the B. F. M. to put Dr. Brux on the salary list, but to return him to India" (Min. p. 9). On that basis the Board would presumably have withheld salary even after our return to India, because the Report does not state that I should be returned *with salary*! Consistency, thou art a jewel!

The promise of Christian love and fairness made by the representatives of the Board at Synod was admitted, also the promise to have my salary begin on July 1, 1935, though in the mind of Dr. Arndt the definite promise had by now become merely "a fond hope which we cherished." Yet he added: "It was the intention of the Board to have this salary begin July the first; that our Board felt they would do" (Min. p. 3). Even the obligation to provide maintenance till the time of our return to India was admitted. To the question put by a brother "whether its [the Board's] members feel that a one-time grant is reasonable, is charitable, in the amount of \$150.00 and within keeping of Christian love, and whether they expect Dr. Brux to get along on this sum for that time," Dr. Arndt replied: "Brethren, you might know we did not expect him to live on that. We tried to tide him over" (Min. p. 11). Dr. Arndt failed to state, however, in what way they had tried, apart from the "one-time grant," to tide us over. The resolution of the Board of July 6 as reported to me by Dr. Brand in his letter of July 8 (see pp. 17 f.) breathed a rather different spirit, as the reader may see for himself. In explanation of this resolution and Dr. Brand's letter of July 8, in which I was told categorically that the Board had resolved that "you are not on the salary of the Board," Dr. Arndt stated: "This indicates that he will not be on salary during this time should the result of the medical examination be unfavorable" (Min. p. 4). However, receipt of the physician's favorable report was acknowledged by Dr. Brand under date of July 11—a fact which Dr. Arndt failed to mention in his account at the meeting—and yet the Board's attitude on maintenance remained unaltered. Later in the discussion another explanation was offered. Dr. Arndt stated: "Dr. Brand had the call in his pocket on his visit to Chicago . . . It was the definite instruction of the B. F. M. that if he accepted the document the salary was to begin July 1 (Min. p. 9) . . . We had hoped to make it retroactive" (Min. p. 18). If this is true, why was this fact not mentioned in Dr. Brand's letter of July 8 which allegedly reported the resolution of the Board? And why did Dr. Brand refrain from mentioning this fact to me on his visit in Chicago on Sept. 2 and, on the contrary, declare that the Board had merely resolved to put me on the salary scale

*The minutes comprise 43 typewritten pages and are thus far too long to present here, to say nothing of the difficulty those who were not present in the meeting would have in understanding some of the brief statements.

†It must be added here that during the discussion of the Board's alleged efforts to carry out Synod's resolution Dr. Behnken remarked that "unfortunately, due to the newness of my office on my part, no definite action was taken [by the Board of Directors on July 17, when Revs. Kuehnert and List brought their plea for funds before the Board]. It was at a time when I attempted to be pastor of a congregation and Chairman of the Board of Directors, and some things were not done that should have been attended to" (Min. p. 8). Dr. Behnken assumed also the responsibility for Dr. Brand's absence at this meeting (Min. p. 12).

which would obtain if I had been in service without interruption? There is something strange and mysterious about these resolutions of the Board.

But facts have a way of coming to the surface. Dr. Arndt's mention of the Board's intention to issue a *new* call instead of accepting Synod's resolution as a re-establishment of the *status quo ante* revealed that the Board, not finding in the Report adopted by Synod a declaration of guilty against me, but merely a *withdrawal* of the appeal and a *withdrawal* of the charge of false doctrine, *was obviously determined to extract its own confession of guilt from me by demanding acceptance of a new call and making the payment of salary from July 1, 1935, conditional on such acceptance, in spite of the fact that the Report does not stipulate a new call, but "recommends" that I be returned, the word "recommend" to be taken, as the representatives of the Board agreed in committee to understand it, in the sense of "instruct"* (see statement by Attorney Rentner, pp. 13 f.). One wonders why the Board did not argue in this matter as it did with regard to salary, namely that since the Report did not stipulate a new call the Board could not issue one. Truly, consistency, thou art a jewel!

The implications of the "new" call were at once apparent to some of the brethren. "It is inescapable not to see that there is here a reflection on the past action of the Board," declared one brother, adding the query: "Would the new call be sent to *cancel* the old?" But further discussion of this important point was promptly quashed by Dr. Behnken, who declared: "We should not judge motives. The purpose was to have the salary be made retroactive to July 1" (Min. p. 18).

During the discussions various brethren who had been present in the last open session of the Committee stressed the fact that the statement in the Report: "We hold Brother Brux eligible for the ministry," was a declaration *re-establishing* the *status quo ante* and that therefore there can be no question of my being entitled to salary from July 1, 1935, as well as to back salary from Dec. 1, 1932, to June 30, 1935 (see the statements of these brethren on pp. 14-16). To meet these statements the Board's representatives saw fit to shift again from a "liberal" interpretation of the Report, which they preferred when discussing the matter of a new call, to a very literalistic one and to explain the sentence: "We hold Brother Brux eligible for the ministry," thus: "Eligibility for the ministry does not put the man into the ministry, this does not necessarily mean thereby he is reinstated. The Board [should be Committee!] could have adopted the *status quo ante* . . . They recommended that he be returned to the field of his former endeavors . . . On the strength of this statement the status of Dr. Brux is not that the former relation was re-established and is not now a missionary on furlough, nor does this constitute a call. This is no more than a declaration for the eligibility for the ministry in the foreign fields" (Min. p. 11). But the precious jewel consistency is never spurned without disastrous results. Soon after the above lengthy explanation of the word "eligible" had been made by Vice-Pres. Kretzschmar, Attorney Rentner, a member of the Committee, pointed out (see his full statement on pp. 13 f.) that when Synod, by adopting the Report, "recommended" that I be returned, the word "recommend" had the meaning of "instruct," and, in line with this, that by the declaration of eligibility "*the status quo was thereby established, involving the necessary implications*" (Min. p. 15).

Not finding support for the Board's interpretation of the sentence: "We hold Brother Brux eligible for the ministry," the representatives of the Board and Dr. Pfotenhauer began to take refuge in a renewal of the charge of *heresy*. The doctrinal issue involved had, of course, been settled by Synod, and this fact was

pointed out repeatedly by some of the brethren (see their statments on pp. 14-16). Furthermore, neither the first form of the doctrinal statement adopted by the Committee nor the second, briefer form adopted by Synod was in any way repudiated by me, nor were they repudiated by the representatives of the Board. Whence, then, the charge of heresy? It was based on my letter to the Board of Sept. 8, 1935 (see pp. 18-20). My understanding of the Report, based on the interpretation of its statements as given me at Synod by Rev. Strieter, the Chairman of the Committee (see pp. 5-8), was held by the representatives of the Board and by Dr. Pfotenhauer to constitute a repudiation of the settlement effected at Synod (Min. pp. 24-27). *An anomalous situation indeed. Acceptance of the interpretation of a report given by the chairman of a committee constitutes a repudiation of the report on the part of him who accepts the interpretation.* But that is not all. Having pointed out in that same letter that the position defined in the doctrinal statement of the Report — which Dr. Arndt admitted to be scriptural—is “the position I had set forth in my conference paper in India in 1924, in the revised and enlarged paper submitted to the Board in 1931, and in the printed paper issued in June of this year (1935),” and that this was repeatedly stated by me in committee at Cleveland, the first version even embodying the words: “He [Dr. Brux] states that this has always been his position” (see this statement in its context on p. 3), this constitutes evidence in the mind of the Board that my understanding of the doctrinal statement—my own statement, by the way, not the Board’s—is wrong and constitutes heresy and, for the Board, puts the controversy where it was before Synod adopted the Report. I pointed out the unfairness of this (Min. pp. 24 f.), but I shall not burden the reader with my own statements. I shall instead adduce the statements of several of the brethren. Said Rev. Maurer: “This is out of order, the matter was settled by Synod. Dr. Brux never stated that his essay was final, he considered it as a contribution to the discussion . . . Synod accepted it as a satisfactory contribution on prayer-fellowship. What right have we to dig up what Synod has declared satisfactory? It was recommended to the pastoral conferences for study at the hand of pertinent Scripture passages . . . What right have we to dig up the controversy? Unless we change from that decision of Synod this is out of order (Min. p. 26). If the B. F. M. insists he has recamped [should be: recanted] his position, he has not done so” (Min. p. 28). Rev. Dankworth pointed out: “The Board on the basis of the essay adjudged Dr. Brux guilty of heresy. The essay is not considered final but a contribution to discussion. The Committee is convinced he is not a heretic. There is the crux of the matter. Dr. Brux feels his essay on prayer-fellowship is epitomized in the statement, which was adopted as a statement, or does the Board feel that it was rejected? . . . If the Board feels the statement is a repudiation of the essay, scriptural proof must be supplied. If it is a subscription to his essay, then his position was accepted” (Min. p. 27). To these arguments Dr. Arndt replied: “We must not misunderstand the document of Synod, not Dr. Brux’ paper but merely the pertinent Scripture passages are recommended for further study. Synod did not refer to the study of Dr. Brux’ paper in paragraph two” (Min. p. 28). In reply to this I pointed out that this interpretation of the paragraph in question is in violation of the last paragraph of the first version of the Committee’s Report (see p. 4), where not merely the pertinent Bible passages were recommended for study but *the entire question itself* and thereby also my paper as a *contribution toward this study*. It will be recalled that in the open session of the Committee on June 26 it was agreed that the rest of the matters not particularly discussed in that meeting should remain as agreed on in the first version of the

Report (see p. 5). The matter of submitting the issue for study to the pastoral conferences was one of them. Hence I stated at the Chicago meeting: "This is altogether different from what was agreed to in the first draft, this was not changed in the committee session. I had agreed to the first draft. When the change was introduced, I was not informed, I did not understand it thus in the first session [should be: version]. A study of the Scripture passages implies a study of the issue itself, namely of the doctrine and the practice based upon the Scripture passages. A proper exegesis on [should be: of the Bible passages entering into] the study of the question certainly involves the issue itself" (Min. p. 31).

Dr. Arndt, continuing his previous statement, added: "In Dr. Brux' essay there are a number of things that should have to be removed if the prayer-fellowship essay is to be accepted" (Min. p. 28). In illustration he referred to the following paragraph on p. 71 of *Christian Prayer-Fellowship and Unionism*:

"Now each of these two Bible passages was written in connection with statements that deal with the universal church (see Eph. 2, 19-22, and 3, 6), and are meant by Paul to state what holds for *all* members of the church universal. Furthermore, our study of Eph. 4, 5 ('one Lord, one faith, one baptism'), has shown (pp. 62 f.), and our reference to the Apology (p. 63) has attested, that the expression 'one faith' does not, and cannot, mean one complete and perfect orthodoxy, but only *one and the same fundamental faith in Christ as Redeemer*. What is stated in Eph. 2, 18 and in 3, 12 holds, therefore, not only for those who agree in every particular of Christian doctrine, i. e., for the orthodox members of the church universal, but for all of its members, i. e., for all who accept Christ as their Redeemer and Lord. Access to God in prayer, be it private or joint prayer, is '*by one Spirit*' and '*by the faith of Him,*' not by one and complete orthodox confession. This makes prayer and prayer-fellowship possible for *all* believers, for *all* redeemed, for *all* children of God."

"There," exclaimed Dr. Arndt, "Dr. Brux declares that prayer-fellowship with Moslems is possible; for the words 'all redeemed' include the Moslems." At this method of reading heresy into a statement fully guarded by its context a number of the brethren appropriately voiced their indignation. Assuredly, the Board must have a poor case indeed if in its effort to prove heresy it is constrained to adduce such "evidence."

Not having succeeded along this line, Dr. Arndt launched an attack against the position taken in Part III of *Christian Prayer-Fellowship and Unionism*, which is briefly stated in points 4 and 5 of my "Concluding Summary" (see pp. 9 f. of this *Re-appeal*), and exclaimed: ". . . You state this prayer-fellowship with members of heterodox churches is a priori permissible. That is the point at issue. There cannot be a compromise and therefore we cannot send him out" (Min. p. 28). To my query whether Dr. Arndt accepts the doctrinal statements agreed on at Synod he replied that he does accept them and that both are scriptural—a declaration which the secretary failed to record but which necessarily forms the basis of my following rejoinder: "According to the first draft, after you agreed to the doctrinal statement, you can no longer correct it. It must stand in the sense in which it was accepted. No Scripture passage prohibits prayer-fellowship. There are passages which prohibit compromise [of truth], unionism, and giving offense" (Min. p. 29). In the discussion that ensued it was pointed out by other brethren as well as by myself that if there is no passage in Scripture prohibiting prayer-fellowship with such as we must regard as Christians, then the question whether a

violation of our confessional position or unionism or giving of offense is involved or not is a question of casuistry, as pointed out in the doctrinal statement embodied in the Report. Attention was called likewise to the fact that the Board did not to date produce proof of Scriptural error in my position, and I protested against these recurrent charges of heresy without proof of heresy from the Scriptures (Min. p. 35). This was resented and the allegation made that proof was brought but not accepted. In reply it was shown that the Board's "proof" did not prove the charge, not only to me but to scores of brethren as well, and that the Board never claimed that clear proof had been given (Min. pp. 37 f.). One brother called attention to the fact that his conference had asked the Board for scriptural proof of error of my position and that it had received none to the present day (Min. p. 17). Assuredly, proof of error cannot be claimed to have been brought when such requests are not met (for a later refusal by Dr. Arndt to give proof to me when he again raised the charge of heresy see pp. 37-45) and when even members of the B. F. M. are at variance among themselves with regard to the applicability of Rom. 16, 17-18, the passage on which the Board chooses to base its position.

Reference has already been made to the uncertainty in Synod with respect to the scriptural position on prayer-fellowship with Christians of other church bodies or denominations—a fact that was clearly expressed in the last paragraph of the first version of the Report (see pp. 30 f. and the paragraph in question on p. 4). This was given expression again by Vice-Pres. Kretzschmar when he declared that "the question of prayer-fellowship will be before Synod for solution from year to year" (Min. p. 41). One cannot but ask in view of this: If the question of prayer-fellowship is one that will occupy Synod for some time to come, why should the Board and Dr. Pfotenhauer view it as a closed issue with regard to me? Apparently they prefer to have it an open issue for themselves but closed to others.

The plight of the Board and of Dr. Pfotenhauer is indicated by the methods through which they attempted to uphold their position. For during the course of the doctrinal discussion Dr. Pfotenhauer, instead of arguing with Scripture, attempted to cut the Gordian knot with a legalistic axe, that is, by a legalistic application of Article VI of the Constitution, ignoring the fact that this same Constitution in Article VII states that "all matters of doctrine and of conscience shall be decided only by the Word of God." Why should recourse to such methods be felt necessary if scriptural proof of error is available?

The outcome of the whole discussion was an offer made by the representatives of the Board and again by Vice-Pres. Kretzschmar (Min. p. 41) to call everything square and return me to India if I would "withdraw" my letter of Sept. 8, 1935, to the Board (see pp. 18-20). The purpose of this offer was obvious; but it was another case of equivocation, as was pointed out by me (Min. p. 36); for not *withdrawal* of the letter was wanted but *recantation of its statements*; and when I declared myself willing to *withdraw* the letter if the Board would *withdraw* its request for my interpretation of the Report given in that letter, the representatives of the Board flatly refused. Not only so, but Dr. Pfotenhauer declared: "Dr. Brux should . . . make a correction of his statement when he withdraws the letter to the F. M. B. in agreement with this document. If there are no corrections made today we shall return to the old stand" (Min. p. 42). All of this in view of the statement (see pp. 13 f.) by Attorney Otto Rentner, a member of the Committee, which in essentials upholds the interpretation of the Report given by me in my letter of Sept. 8, 1935. Is any further evidence required that Dr. Brand, the B. F. M., and Dr. Pfotenhauer are determined to uphold their former position in spite of all evidence showing error on their part and in spite of Synod's adoption

of the Report which re-established my status? When in 1933 the Daib-Dau-Laetsch Fiduciary Committee unanimously recommended to the B. F.M. that the case be reopened, Dr. Brand and the Board, on the recommendation of Dr. Pfotenhauer, ignored the report. Now that Synod has spoken, Dr. Brand and the Board, again with the concurrence of Dr. Pfotenhauer, ignore even Synod's resolution.

Will Synod tolerate this?

IV

SYNOD'S POSITION ON PRAYER-FELLOWSHIP IN THE LIGHT OF ITS ADOPTION OF THE DOCTRINAL STATEMENT IN THE REPORT

A careful reading of the doctrinal statement in the Report will reveal the following important points:

1) The first sentence of the doctrinal statement: "Scriptures very plainly prohibit compromise of the truth, indifference to doctrine, unionism, and giving of offense, and therefore forbid every kind of prayer-fellowship which involves one of these objectionable features," implies as a necessary truth that *prayer-fellowship which does not involve one of these objectionable features is permissible*. In fact, this truth forms the necessary basis of the second sentence: "There are in the domain of casuistry cases where the question whether unionistic prayer-fellowship is involved cannot be answered in advance"; for if prayer-fellowship with erring Christians whom we must still regard as fellow-members of the universal Christian church necessarily involved the objectionable features referred to, *this second sentence of the doctrinal statement could not have been made*. The fact that it has been made and that it was accepted by Synod as scriptural clearly means, therefore, that Synod's position on prayer-fellowship with Christians not affiliated with the Synodical Conference is that *according to the Scriptures such prayer-fellowship is possible and permissible except when it involves compromise of the truth, indifference to doctrine, unionism, and giving of offense*.

2) The words "in the domain of casuistry" clearly imply that *all cases of prayer-fellowship with Christians not affiliated with the Synodical Conference belong to the domain of casuistry*, that is, that they are cases which, when they arise, must each be judged in the light of the existing circumstances as to whether or not they involve one of the objectionable features referred to: In the first version of the Report this was stated thus: "*In the field of casuistry we are confronted with many situations that cause no little perplexity in our church today. In fact, the matter of Christian prayer-fellowship has become a burning question*" (see p. 4). As in all cases of casuistry, so here too, the circumstances under which prayer-fellowship would not be permissible can, in a general way, be defined, but there will always be cases involving special and unforeseen (in fact, unforeseeable) circumstances which cannot be described in advance. Hence the statement: "There are in the domain of casuistry cases where the question whether unionistic prayer-fellowship is involved cannot be answered in advance."

3) The doctrinal statement embodied in the Report clearly could not have been made except on the ground that the Scriptures do not prohibit prayer-fellowship as such with Christians not affiliated with the Synodical Conference; for if prayer-fellowship as such with erring Christians were forbidden in the Scriptures, Synod would have had no right to say—as in effect it does say in the doctrinal statement of the Report—that such prayer-fellowship *is permissible except* under certain circumstances (see Appendix, pp. 61 and 67). The scriptural fact that prayer-fellowship as such with Christians not affiliated with the Synodical Conference is permissible is thus a necessarily implied premise of the doctrinal statement adopted in the Report. This premise was clearly understood by the Committee when the

statement was accepted by it (see p. 4), and in the first version of the Report it was expressly stated thus: "So far as direct Scripture teaching on prayer-fellowship is concerned, there is no passage, so far as we know, that expressly prohibits prayer-fellowship with erring Christians whom we must still regard as members of the universal Christian church." This being unquestionably the premise of the doctrinal statement, it follows that prayer-fellowship with Christians not affiliated with the Synodical Conference is as such permissible, is in fact God's will and intended to be the normal Christian practice (see Appendix, p. 57), even as our Catechism in answer to Question 222: "Why are we to say, 'Our Father'?" states it to be in the words: "Because all believers are in Christ the children of one Father, and *should, therefore, pray for and with each other.*" In other words, the big scriptural fact on which the doctrinal statement of the Report rests is the permissibility, the God-pleasing character, and the normalcy of prayer-fellowship as such with Christians whom we must still regard as members of the universal Christian church. On this truth compare also Appendix, pp. 57-59 and 65-67. Hence, in adopting the doctrinal statement embodied in the Report, the Committee and Synod reiterated, though in other words, the position stated in the Catechism. *Only when this is granted is there any sense in speaking of exceptional cases or cases of casuistry* (see Appendix, pp. 67 f.). And as the Scriptures (and, in accord with them, the Catechism) have set forth the normalcy and God-pleasing character of such prayer-fellowship, so have they indicated also the *exceptions to the rule*. These were referred to in the first version of the doctrinal statement thus: "There are, however, passages which prohibit compromise of truth, indifference to doctrine, unionism, and giving of offense." This was followed by the conclusion: "Hence every kind of prayer-fellowship which involves one of these objectionable features must be avoided." Our Catechism, in its answer to Question 222, has not referred to these exceptions because they do not come within the range of an answer to the question: "Why are we to say, 'Our Father'?" They belong rather to the section "Of the Church," Questions 184-93. While the question of prayer-fellowship with Christians not affiliated with the Synodical Conference is not specifically taken up in those questions, thus much is clear: The answer dare not overthrow the scriptural facts mentioned with regard to prayer-fellowship in Question 222 nor those with regard to the universal Christian church in Questions 185 and 187, otherwise the statement of these doctrines is utterly meaningless and futile. And obviously anyone who attempts to push the limitations of prayer-fellowship with Christians not affiliated with the Synodical Conference to the point where they violate and, in fact, dissolve the doctrine of the universal church is serving Synod ill.

4) On the basis of the doctrinal statement in the Report and its evident and necessary implications the position of Synod may therefore be stated thus: PRAYER-FELLOWSHIP WITH ERRING CHRISTIANS WHOM WE MUST STILL REGARD AS FELLOW-MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CHURCH IS AS SUCH NOT PROHIBITED IN THE SCRIPTURES, BUT IS, ON THE CONTRARY, TAKEN FOR GRANTED AND ENCOURAGED AS THE NORMAL AND PROPER EXERCISE OF CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP, AS THE CATECHISM ALSO STATES IT TO BE IN THE WORDS: "BECAUSE ALL BELIEVERS ARE IN CHRIST THE CHILDREN OF ONE FATHER, AND SHOULD, THEREFORE, PRAY FOR AND WITH EACH OTHER." HOWEVER, SINCE THE SCRIPTURES FORBID COMPROMISE OF THE TRUTH, INDIFFERENCE TO DOCTRINE, UNIONISM, AND GIVING OF OFFENSE, ANY ACT OF PRAYER-FELLOWSHIP INVOLVING ONE OF THESE OBJECTIONABLE FEATURES IS ON THAT GROUND PROHIBITED; AND SINCE THE POSSIBILITY OF THE INVOLVEMENT OF SUCH AN OBJECTIONABLE FEATURE MAY AL-

WAYS BE PRESENT. CASES OF PRAYER-FELLOWSHIP WITH ERRING CHRISTIANS WHOM WE MUST STILL REGARD AS FELLOW-MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CHURCH ARE CASES OF CASUISTRY. THE DECISION AS TO WHETHER IN A GIVEN CASE PRAYER-FELLOWSHIP IS PERMISSIBLE OR NOT PERMISSIBLE IS BY THE SCRIPTURES LEFT TO THE CONSCIENCES OF THE INDIVIDUAL CHRISTIANS AND HENCE IS LEFT THERE BY SYNOD ALSO. SYNOD THEREFORE MAKES NO ATTEMPT, NOR WILL IT TOLERATE ANY ATTEMPT, TO LEGISLATE WITH REGARD TO THE FREQUENCY OR INFREQUENCY OF THE INVOLVEMENT OF THE OBJECTIONABLE FEATURES REFERRED TO.

V

DEMONSTRATION THAT THE INTERPRETATION WHICH DR. BRAND, THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS, AND DR. PFOTENHAUER NOW PUT ON THE DOCTRINAL STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE REPORT IS UNTENABLE

The doctrinal statement embodied in the Report, its obvious premise, and its necessary implications are, as was pointed out in the preceding chapter, definite and clear, and the possibility of a difference of opinion would seem to be ruled out. Yet Dr. Brand, the B. F. M., and Dr. Pfotenhauer insist on taking a view of this statement that involves its complete overthrow and would substitute for it an unscriptural and legalistic position, namely that prayer-fellowship with Christians not affiliated with the Synodical Conference is presumptively (a priori and inherently) *prohibited*.* In their opinion, difference in doctrine—nonfundamental, of course, since we are speaking of such persons as we must regard as members of the universal Christian church—and membership in a body not affiliated with the Synodical Conference constitute a positive bar to prayer-fellowship on the assumption that prayer-fellowship with such in itself involves a compromise of the truth, indifference to doctrine, unionism, and giving of offense. This is for them the

*This summarization is based on statements made by Dr. Arndt and Dr. Pfotenhauer at the meeting of Nov. 7, 1935. Dr. Arndt said: "You state this prayer-fellowship with members of heterodox churches is a priori permissible. That is the point at issue. There cannot be a compromise and therefore we cannot send him out (Min. p. 28). The prohibition is . . . implied. With you it is a permissible thing; a priori, the natural thing, it is the normal thing. This is in violation of a number of passages. Christ said we should 'teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.' You do not hold what Christ teaches (Min. p. 29). [On the inapplicability of this passage to the question of prayer-fellowship see Appendix, p. 62, and CHRISTIAN PRAYER-FELLOWSHIP AND UNIONISM, pp. 55 and 58.] There are not any Scripture passages which expressly prohibit this [prayer-fellowship with erring Christians whom we must regard as members of the universal Christian church; cf. first version of doctrinal statement, point 1, on p. 3] with a literal statement. There are many passages which prohibit this by implication, as for instance, 'teaching them to observe all things,' and again, 'if ye continue in my words then are ye my disciples indeed,' 'a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump' (Min. p. 32). [On the inapplicability of these passages see Appendix, p. 62 f, and CHRISTIAN PRAYER-FELLOWSHIP AND UNIONISM, pp. 55-58 and 60 f.] He who teaches false doctrine is unfaithful to Christ, and before we can enter prayer-fellowship with him he must be corrected (Min. p. 32). It [this implied prohibition of prayer-fellowship with heterodox Christians] belongs to the first group [first point of the first version of the doctrinal statement] (Min. p. 32). THIS IS A MATTER OF FALSE TEACHING, I'M NOT FOR PRAYER-FELLOWSHIP (Min. p. 33). . . . BEFORE THERE CAN BE PRAYER-FELLOWSHIP ANY DEVIATION FROM SCRIPTURE IS A SIN AND ERECTS A BAR AND THERE MUST BE SOME ADJUSTMENT" (Min. p. 33). Dr. Pfotenhauer stated: "PRAYER-FELLOWSHIP IS AGAINST THE CLEAR STATEMENT OF GOD'S WORD AND IS IN A CLASS WITH PULPIT AND ALTER-FELLOWSHIP WITH HETERODOX CHRISTIANS (Min. p. 30). We know that in all churches there are children of God, but WE CANNOT EXERCISE PRAYER-FELLOWSHIP WITH THEM SINCE GOD'S WORD FORBIDS US TO ENTER INTO THEIR CAMP" (Min. p. 34). When asked for the scriptural proof for this statement, he replied: "God's Word does not allow us to have communion with those who are not Christians. We cannot reach them" (Min. p. 34). Reminded that he is putting Christians into the same pot with unbelievers, he continued: "Those people must get out of that camp. God's Word forbids to have communion with them, therefore we must avoid them" (Min. p. 34). Shown that the context of the passage referred to (2 Cor. 6, 14-18) does not refer to Christians and that the passage therefore does not apply, he nevertheless stated: "We should not enter into communion with them" (Min. p. 34). Reminded that if husband and wife of different faiths may pray together at home, the same principle will apply also outside of the home, he declared: "This is a question of casuistry" (Min. p. 35).

rule, the normal thing, to which there may be very occasional exceptions which they call cases of "casuistry."

This position on the part of Dr. Brand, the Board of Foreign Missions, and Dr. Pfotenhauer constitutes a complete reversal of the scriptural doctrine agreed on in the Report and expressed also in the Catechism; for:

1) The premise that "there is no passage [of Scripture], so far as we know, that expressly prohibits prayer-fellowship with erring Christians whom we must still regard as members of the universal Christian church," which was agreed on in the first version of the doctrinal statement (see p. 3) and was conceded at the time the shorter statement was drawn up (see p. 4) and is necessarily implied in it, is for all practical purposes ignored by them and held to have no bearing on the question of prayer-fellowship with heterodox Christians.

2) For this scriptural premise there is substituted by them the unscriptural assumption that prayer-fellowship with Christians not affiliated with the Synodical Conference in itself, and therefore normally, involves compromise of the truth, indifference to doctrine, unionism, and giving of offense. This assumption is unscriptural because none of the Scripture passages adduced prove it. On this point see Appendix, pp. 60-65, and *Christian Prayer-Fellowship and Unionism*, pp. 55-58 and 60 f.

3) In line with this unproved assumption, the doctrinal statement of the Report that "Scriptures very plainly prohibit compromise of the truth, indifference to doctrine, unionism, and giving of offense, and *therefore forbid every kind of prayer-fellowship which involves one of these objectionable features*" is ignored by them and, in effect, made to read: "and therefore forbid every kind of prayer-fellowship with heterodox Christians *because* such prayer-fellowship is equivalent to entering 'the camp' of the heterodox Christians and necessarily and thus normally involves one of these objectionable features."

4) The sentence of the doctrinal statement that "there are in the domain of casuistry cases where the question whether unionistic prayer-fellowship is involved cannot be answered in advance," whereby all cases of prayer-fellowship with Christians not affiliated with the Synodical Conference are declared to be cases of casuistry and hence to be left to the decision of the consciences of the individual Christians, is, in effect, made by them to read: "Cases of prayer-fellowship with Christians not affiliated with the Synodical Conference are, by implication, definitely prohibited." On that basis *no such prayer-fellowship is imaginable in which compromise of the truth, unionism, or giving of offense are not involved*. For anything that is wrong in itself (inherently, being by implication forbidden in the Scriptures) cannot be right under any circumstances whatsoever, and what God, even by implication, has declared to be wrong, man has no authority to declare right, be it for reasons of charity, church polity, or what not (see Appendix, pp. 61 and 67 f.). Obedience is better than sacrifice. Cases of casuistry are thus excluded. And yet, when confronted with the case of a Missouri Lutheran husband praying with his Methodist wife, or vice versa, the answer is given by Dr. Pfotenhauer: "That is a case of casuistry!" In other words, he means to say it is a case in which compromise of truth, unionism, or giving of offense are *not* involved. Obviously, he is contradicting himself; for when he allows this one case, he can no longer contend that prayer-fellowship with Christians not of the Synodical Conference is by implication prohibited in Scripture. For if prayer-fellowship with such Christians is prohibited in the Scriptures not under certain circumstances only, but generally and comprehensively, who is he to permit or allow what God has forbidden? All of which indicates that the term "casuistry," as used by Dr. Pfotenhauer and by Dr. Brand and the Board of For-

eign Missions as well, has an altogether new and unique sense which, under the guise of its usual meaning, covers up (not intentionally but nevertheless quite successfully) a violation of the Scriptures as they themselves understand them and which they profess to honor so highly. It is, in fact, an "escape mechanism" from a position on prayer-fellowship which they themselves as Christians find unworkable and intolerable.

From the above it is clear and unmistakable (1) that by their position on prayer-fellowship with heterodox Christians Dr. Brand, the B. F. M., and Dr. Pfotenhauer violate and overthrow the Scriptural position of Synod as stated in the Report; (2) that by making exceptions (cases of "casuistry") contrary to what they state to be the doctrine of Scripture they violate even the Scriptures as they themselves interpret them (for they presume to make exceptions where the Scriptures, as they interpret them, do not make them); (3) that by so doing they indicate that they love their own traditions more than they do the Scriptures.

This is unquestionably a serious situation in Synod. Synod agrees to a doctrinal statement on prayer-fellowship with Christians not affiliated with the Synodical Conference; the B. F. M., Dr. Brand, and Dr. Pfotenhauer undertake to reverse it and to substitute for it their own "doctrine." The Scriptures, and in accord with them Synod also, leave cases of prayer-fellowship with heterodox Christians to the individual consciences of the Christians; the B. F. M., Dr. Brand, and Dr. Pfotenhauer apparently think the Scriptures too lax and undertake to make good this defect by declaring prohibited *in general* what the Scriptures themselves forbid *under certain circumstances only*.

Will Synod tolerate this?

VI

REFUSAL OF DR. ARNDT TO GIVE PROOF OF HIS CHARGE OF HERESY

It will be recalled (see p. 32) that when at the meeting in Chicago Dr. Arndt again raised the charge of heresy without furnishing scriptural proof I protested against such procedure as unbrotherly. On that occasion I stated: "Christian love demands that if we charge someone with error it must be proved, that is the proper procedure. The charges have never been supported by proof, and this is in direct violation of Christian brotherly love. If this charge is made again, I will protest to Synod. This cannot go on any longer" (Min. p. 35). Yet on Nov. 14, a week after the meeting, Dr. Arndt, in a letter addressed to Rev. W. Speckhard, Clintonville, Wisconsin, and to me, undertook to write concerning "the charge of false doctrine which we raise against the pamphlet of Brother Brux on Prayer-Fellowship." In amplification of the charge he stated:

"Dr. Brux' pamphlet is written in defense of the thesis that prayer-fellowship with members of heterodox churches is a priori permissible, yea, normal. That means that we would have to regard, a priori, fellowship permissible and normal with people who have written on their flag: 'Down with the real presence!' 'Down with the doctrine of baptismal regeneration!' 'Down with infant baptism!' How can a Lutheran who is convinced that the teachings mentioned are divine assent to the principle that a priori he ought to have fellowship with people who directly reject them? All the Scripture passages that speak of the majesty of the divine Word must at once rise in his consciousness and forbid acceptance of such a principle; for instance, Isa. 66, 2b: 'But to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit and trembleth at My Word.' Matt. 28, 20: 'Teaching them to

observe all things whatsoever I have commended you.' Luke 11, 28: 'Blessed are they that hear the Word of God and keep it.' John 17, 17: 'Sanctify them through Thy truth; Thy Word is truth.' There you have the thing in a nutshell. People that come to me having put on their flag rejection of these divine teachings which are dear to me, cannot expect that I a priori declare that I will have religious fellowship with them. It may become apparent when I enter into conversation with one of these people that I am dealing with a person who is rejecting the divine truth in ignorance and who is quite willing to be instructed. Then the situation gets to be different. But that is not the point at issue. I think that I have stated the *status controversiae* fairly above, and I believe that when once the real meaning of what Dr. Brux is contending for is grasped, there will be but few members of our Synod that will declare themselves willing to accept his position."

Since at that time Rev. Speckhard and I were corresponding with Dr. Arndt with regard to his misrepresentation of an offer made on Oct. 11, 1932 (see pp. 45-54), and desiring, so far as I was concerned, to settle this matter before taking up a new one, I replied under date of Nov. 24, 1935, that the charge of heresy "will be taken up after the question concerning your proposal will have been disposed of." Rev. Speckhard, however, under date of Nov. 16, 1935, replied to the charge as follows:

"You have not stated the *status controversiae* fairly. Just the other day I went through Dr. Brux' paper again to assure myself that the impressions from my first reading of it were correct, and I found again that if there is anything that he tries to make clear it is the distinction between universal Christian fellowship and denominational fellowship, and that if there is one thing he tries to guard against it is the impression that he ignores doctrinal differences. If he says it once, he says it so often to be almost wearisome: 'Where no offense is given and no denominational fellowship is involved.' Furthermore, he repeatedly says: 'When there is need for it'; in other words, the Christian is not to look for such opportunities for prayer-fellowship, but he should not seek to escape them when they present themselves. Therefore the *status controversiae* is thus correctly stated: Prayer-fellowship with members of heterodox churches is permissible when there is need for it and when no offense is given and no denominational fellowship involved. And, if you will, look at other aspects of this matter. You somewhat dramatically speak of the people who have written on their flag: 'Down with the real presence etc.' (As if any of these said in their hearts: 'We know that the real presence is plainly written in the Scripture, but we do not care. Down with it.') But what about people who accept all these but differ from us on other points, the Ohio Synod for instance, or the United Lutheran Church. I wish you were pastor of my congregation and would try to make it clear to my people that they must not pray with their relatives and friends of the Ohio church (the two churches here are very closely interrelated, most of the members of the Ohio church having been years ago members of the Missouri church). I wonder how far you would get.

"Finally, if it was your conviction at the time of the Cleveland convention that Brux was retracting in the statement of his position given in the resolutions, why did you not insist on a different wording of the resolution? If you considered his paper as dangerous as you now say you do, why did you not insist that the resolutions say: 'Dr. Brux' paper on prayer-fellowship is rejected'? Instead, the resolutions clearly imply that his paper still stands as a first, not final contribution to the study of prayer-fellowship. For in the

resolutions exception is taken to various statements made by Brux in his paper (none of them affecting prayer-fellowship) and these are satisfactorily explained by Dr. Brux, which indicates that the paper as a whole still stands, for one does not take exception to individual statements in a paper if one means to reject the whole. Then, again, there are the bald statements: 'Brux states his doctrinal position thus,' without one qualifying 'now' or other word to indicate that this is other than he always held. 'We hold Dr. Brux eligible for the ministry,' not one qualifying 'now' or 'therefore' to indicate that a change or modification of his position has made him eligible. If you and the rest of the Board were of the opinion that Dr. Brux was recanting in the resolutions, you certainly made every endeavor to disguise that fact in the wording of the resolutions. And how do you explain Brux' action now? If you held Brux to be recanting at Cleveland, you either failed to make that clear to Brux at Cleveland, and that would be almost unforgivable, or you must now accuse Brux of dishonesty, namely of recanting at Cleveland and now claiming that he did not recant. Which is it?

"Again, why did not the Board answer my question addressed to it in a letter shortly after Brux was dismissed from the service: 'Will you give me briefly the position of the Missouri Synod on prayer-fellowship according to which you felt obligated to dismiss Dr. Brux from service?' I have put that question again and again to those who upheld the Mission Board in its action against Brux and never could I get an answer. And if I got an answer it was this: that prayer-fellowship with Christians of heterodox churches is under all circumstances and in all cases forbidden. And you know as well as I that this was the official position of the Missouri Synod on prayer-fellowship, if it had any position at all. And this position, I am quite sure, was in the mind of the Mission Board when it dismissed Dr. Brux. This much I know, that the statement on prayer-fellowship contained in the Cleveland resolution was *not* the official position of the Missouri Synod. If it had been, Brux would never have gotten into trouble in India, i. e. the case of casuistry which gave rise to the whole controversy."

In his reply of Nov. 26, 1935, Dr. Arndt declined to enter upon the points taken up by Rev. Speckhard, declaring: "I am aware that I have not touched on a number of matters Pastor Speckhard alludes to or dwells on. My reply is so brief because I feel the futility of endeavoring to reach an understanding by correspondence."

Apparently it is not futile to make misrepresentations or to raise charges by correspondence, but it is futile (oh so futile!) to answer the questions and representations of those to whom the misrepresentations and charges have been directed and who object to them. Is this what one must expect from one's Christian brethren?

Under date of Jan. 14, 1936, I wrote Dr. Arndt:

"With respect to the misrepresentation of your proposal of Oct. 11, 1932, in your letter to Rev. Speckhard of Sept. 21, 1935, I believe Rev. Speckhard and I have done what it is at present in our power to do personally to lead you to see and acknowledge the unbrotherly character of the misrepresentation involved [see pp. 45-54], and I shall now take up the serious charge raised against me by you and the B. F. M. in your letter of Nov. 14, 1935, which, in your own words, is 'the charge of false doctrine which we raise against the pamphlet of Brother Brux on Prayer-Fellowship.'

"Since the position taken by me in my paper is based on the Scriptures (see Part III of *Christian Prayer-Fellowship and Unionism*), and since the

scriptural argument there receives support from the meaning of the Bible passages discussed in Parts I and II, this position can be shown to be unscriptural only by proving that the exposition and application of the various Bible passages involved is untenable. Merely adducing such general Bible passages as Matt. 28, 20, Luke 11, 28, John 17, 17, and Is. 66, 2b, which refer to attitudes on which we are *agreed* and which are not violated by any contentions of the paper, cannot invalidate the position set forth in the paper.

"The charge of false doctrine is a very serious one, and if Christian ethics require that proof be furnished for *any* charge whatsoever raised against a brother, it is certainly doubly necessary in the case of a charge of false doctrine. I must therefore demand of you and the B. F. M. that you substantiate your charge of false doctrine in the matter of prayer-fellowship, and that you do this in writing, because your charge has been committed to writing, and because my position was submitted to the Board and to Synod in writing. I have been requesting such proof now for upward of *four years*, and it has not been furnished. Your attention was called to this again in the meeting of Nov. 7, 1935, in Chicago, and also to the fact that a similar request made by a pastoral conference in Wisconsin has not been heeded. On that occasion I made representations against the practice of the B. F. M. and of certain synodical and district officials of raising charges and then evading the Christian duty of proving the charges. Your renewed charge of Nov. 14, made within a week of that meeting, constrains me to demand that the charge be either proved within sixty days—which, I believe, is a reasonable length of time for you and the Board to furnish such proof—or that the charge be withdrawn.

"Trusting that you and the Board will see the justice of this demand and will furnish proof of the charge raised by you, I remain, etc."

Since a reply was not forthcoming, I inquired of Dr. Arndt on Feb. 10, 1936: "May I inquire if you have received my letter of Jan. 14th? I should appreciate your kind acknowledgment of having received it, also a brief statement telling me whether or not you propose to meet the request made of you."

To this I received the following reply dated Jan. 21, 1936, with a postscript dated Feb. 13, 1936:

"Your letter of Jan. 14 I received. The justice of your first paragraph I fail to see. My understanding of the situation in general is that you and President Behnken are to confer with each other as to the method to be pursued by you with respect to your appeal. The Mission Board, of which I am a member, is the accused party and is awaiting word from you and President Behnken on the next step. We have not heard that any arrangements have been made for the appointment of a committee to investigate your appeal. Probably news of the appointment of such a committee will reach us soon. In the meantime I feel that I should not carry on a correspondence on the points at issue.

"P. S. As you see, this letter was drafted several weeks ago. I had laid the draft aside, wishing to give the matter some further thought, and in the upheaval incidental to the finals of the first semester the subject was forgotten. Kindly pardon me!"

My reply of Feb. 20 stated:

"My appeal to Synod certainly cannot, with any degree of justice, be advanced by you as a circumstance which alters, or relieves you of, *your* duty to prove *your* charge of false doctrine which *you* have raised against me in a private letter of Nov. 14, 1935, to Rev. Speckhard and myself, or to withdraw

it. In that letter you wrote: '*I myself* feel that there are two points on which *I* must write you, one having to do with my proposal made Oct., 1932, and the other dealing with *the charge of false doctrine* which *we* raise against the pamphlet of Brother Brux on prayer-fellowship.' This charge is certainly clear enough. By using the pronoun '*we*,' you undoubtedly meant to state that the charge is raised not by you only, but by the entire B. F. M. How then can you truthfully state in your reply to my letter of Jan. 14, in which I demanded that you either withdraw this charge of false doctrine or prove it: 'The Mission Board, of which I am a member, is the accused party'? Such steps as I shall find appropriate to take in bringing my appeal before Synod are entirely my affair and, as you will remember, they were stated to be so at our meeting of Nov. 7, 1935. Whatever these steps be, they certainly do not in any manner affect *your* Christian duty either to withdraw your charge or to prove it, much less do they alter this duty or relieve you of it.

"I therefore renew my demand that within a reasonable length of time (sixty days) you either prove your charge or withdraw it."

To this Dr. Arndt replied under date of March 3:

"Your conception of the situation which affects both of us is different from mine, it seems. You have charged, and are charging, the B. F. M. with having taken an unjustified step when it, on account of alleged wrong teaching on your part, declared itself unwilling to send you back to India. That is the matter which has to be investigated, and your appeal, if I understand it correctly, seeks to bring about an investigation by Synod of this very matter. I am waiting for this investigation to take place. . . . It is clear to me that in view of your charge lodged against the Mission Board, of which I am a member, it is not proper for me to attempt a defense of the action of the Mission Board in private when such a defense really belongs before a committee of Synod or the Synod as a whole in convention assembled."

The reader may well ask: Since when is such an attitude against a brother who is charged with false doctrine and demands proof of the charge considered to be proper for a Christian? If the proof is available, why should the brother not receive it at once and Synod also?

My reply of Mar. 15, 1936, therefore stated:

"I feel constrained to point out to you again that your obligation to prove your charge of false doctrine or to withdraw it is unaffected by my appeal to Synod against the Board's failure to carry out Synod's resolutions; for—to mention only one point—your obligation arises from the fact that you made your charge against me in a private capacity in a private letter to Rev. Speckhard and myself dated Nov. 14, 1935, this letter being a reply to my letter of Oct. 30 in which I requested satisfaction with respect to our complaint against you of having misrepresented facts to Rev. Speckhard. I am therefore dealing with you in a private capacity on the basis of your private letter. Since in that private letter you deliberately raised the charge of false doctrine, I must hold you either to prove this charge or to withdraw it. That in your statement of the charge you associated the B. F. M. with yourself does not change the situation; for you were not writing for the B. F. M., but in a private capacity. You are, therefore, as a Christian, under obligation to prove the charge made or to withdraw it, and if you do not care to answer for the B. F. M. because you raised the charge in a private capacity, you are in honor bound to state that in your private letter you really spoke for yourself only and desire to have us understand the charge in this way, thus leaving to the B. F. M. any charge which it may desire to make against me officially. But

you certainly have no right, after having made your charge in a private capacity in personal correspondence, to hide behind the Board because of your membership on the Board and to say that as a member of the Board you cannot now undertake the defense of the Board in a private capacity; for *it was in a private capacity that you made the charge*. If you did not care to answer your charge in private, what right did you have to make the charge in private correspondence?

"Since you have made your charge in a private capacity, you are certainly obligated by every consideration of fairness, justice, and Christian brotherly love to prove your charge in private when called upon to do so, or to withdraw the charge. Failure to do this will, in the nature of the case, involve a violation of the Eighth Commandment; for when a Christian lays a charge against a brother, he has the duty either to prove the charge or to withdraw it, and if he declines to do either, he makes himself guilty either of bearing false witness or of grievously violating the law of brotherly love by refusing to do his Christian duty by his brother (Matt. 18, 15-17; Luke 17, 3; Gal. 6, 1).

"In view of this I call upon you now for the third time in a brotherly spirit that you fulfill the obligation which you assumed when in your private letter to Rev. Speckhard and myself you charged false doctrine against me in the position I have taken in my paper on prayer-fellowship, that is, that you either prove the charge or withdraw it."

To this Dr. Arndt replied on Mar. 26, 1936:

"I am sorry to say that I cannot agree that your view of the matter in question is correct. I am not refusing to discuss the points of difference between you and me, *but I am not willing to do this in private correspondence*. Since it is your desire to have the charge that your pamphlet contains false doctrine investigated, I venture the suggestion that you write to the B. F. M., which raised this charge, and ask it to see to it that an orderly and comprehensive discussion of everything pertaining to the doctrinal aspects of the controversy be arranged. I am utterly unable to understand your logic that if I communicate to somebody else the position of a board of which I am a member, I am in duty bound in a private capacity to defend the position which I communicated to that person. That I am co-responsible for the position taken is true enough, but that this puts on me the obligation of acting in a private role, I fail to see."

How strange! Dr. Arndt, in private correspondence, raises a serious charge, and when asked for proof states: "I am not willing to do this in private correspondence," and because he associated the B. F. M. with himself in the charge attempts to hide behind the B. F. M.! Does membership on the B. F. M. relieve the members of their personal Christian obligations toward a brother whom they personally charge with error and who demands proof of the error in the name of Christian brotherhood and love?

My reply of April 1, 1936, stated:

"The B. F. M. has not to date informed me that after acceptance of the Committee Report at Synod last June it now raises the charge of false doctrine against me and my paper on prayer-fellowship. It is *you* who have made this charge in your private letter to Rev. Speckhard and myself, associating the B. F. M. with yourself. With what right you have done this I do not know; for I have received no communication from the Board to the effect that it raises a charge similar to, or identical with, yours. In your letter to Rev. Speckhard and myself you were writing to us simply as Brother Arndt in reply

to our private representations to you, and not as spokesman of the B. F. M., and there is nothing in your letter to indicate that you were writing, or were authorized to write, for and on behalf of the B. F. M. If the B. F. M. raised the charge, the charge would be communicated officially through its corresponding secretary or through a properly delegated person who would state his authorization. Neither is the case. I am, therefore, in this matter following the only proper course open to me when I address myself to *you* for proof or withdrawal of the charge which *you* have raised. The legitimacy and the justice of this procedure, I trust, you will readily concede, and I furthermore trust that you will do what your Christian duty in the situation created by you requires."

Under date of April 14, 1936, Dr. Arndt replied:

"This is getting to be an extraordinary affair. You say that the B. F. M. has not since the Cleveland meeting raised the charge of false doctrine against you. On the other hand, you have informed the President of Synod that your appeal to Synod again stands and that the case has returned to the *status quo ante synodum*. In this appeal of yours you complain of unjust treatment by the B. F. M. when it on account of doctrinal error on your part refused to return you to India. You have summoned the B. F. M. again to the bar of Synod to defend its action. And now you say that I must in a private capacity defend myself against the charge which you level against the whole Board, myself included. Candidly, I cannot follow you."

To this misrepresentation of the state of affairs by Dr. Arndt I replied under date of April 19, 1936:

"The 'extraordinary' character of our present affair appears to be due entirely to your evading your obligation as a Christian brother to either prove your charge or to withdraw it, and to your attempt to hide behind my appeal and the B. F. M. My letter of Sept. 30, 1935, to Pres. Behnken stated: 'This attitude and action *on the part of the B. F. M.* clearly constitutes a violation of the settlement effected at Synod and invalidates and overthrows this settlement. *The B. F. M. has thus placed matters in status quo ante synodum.* This fact compels me to inform you that my former appeal again lies before Synod, and that to the charges raised therein against the B. F. M. and its General Secretary the charge of violation of the agreement at Synod is now added.' The matter referred to was the failure of the B. F. M. to fulfill the promise of its representatives to do what Christian love and fairness requires, also in a financial way. *This did not touch the former doctrinal issue and hence was not mentioned by me. The doctrinal issue had been disposed of by Synod and will remain settled until Synod itself will alter it.* The doctrinal issue may therefore not be drawn in by you now; for in accepting the doctrinal statement of the Committee Report Synod took the doctrinal matter out of the hands of the B. F. M. and disposed of it. You have no right now to undo Synod's doctrinal settlement or to act as if the settlement did not exist. As a matter of fact, your charge was made only on Nov. 14, one month and a half after my letter to Pres. Behnken, and one week after our meeting of Nov. 7 in Chicago, in which you had agreed that the doctrinal statements embodied in both drafts of the Committee Report are scriptural. In the committee meetings at Synod I had stated time and again that the doctrinal statement of the Committee Report gives the position contended for in my paper and is in all essentials identical with it, and therefore I did not withdraw my paper, but let it stand as a contribution to the study of the issue. If you felt that the paper contained false doctrine, you ought then to have

stated this and proved it Since at that time you did neither, your charge of Nov. 14 is out of order to begin with. But since you raised it nevertheless, you are bound either to prove it or to retract it. And since I have no official information from the Board that the Board as such raises the charge, I must view your charge as that of an individual brother and must hold you to prove it or to withdraw it.

"Your failure to see this is, indeed, extraordinary; but the cause does not lie in me or in my letter of Sept. 30 to Pres. Behnken.

"I believe I have given you every reasonable opportunity to discharge your Christian duty. Your persistent evasion of your obligation leads me to believe that you are determined not to perform your duty and that your charge is, therefore, either false witness or a grievous violation of Christian brotherly love (see my letter to you under date of Mar. 15). However, I sincerely hope that you may see the unbrotherliness of your attitude and do what Christian love requires, so that I might alter the belief stated above."

Dr. Arndt's reply of April 28, 1936, stated:

"With respect to the main contents of your letter I must say that there are several statements in it the correctness of which I cannot grant. There is however only one point to which I shall briefly advert. You raise the issue of brotherliness with respect to my attitude. I think I need not fear at all the verdict of an unbiased committee on the question whether brotherly love is violated by him who speaks of evasions and of hiding behind something in discussing the attitude of his brother or by him who says that he is willing to discuss the points of difference existing between him and his brother at the place which the latter himself has fixed. When you voice the belief that I am either guilty of false witness or of a grievous violation of Christian brotherly love, I feel sorry indeed, but in view of your renewed appeal to Synod I hear my conscience say to me that your serious charge is not justified."

In view of the fact that Dr Arndt, as a member of the B. F. M., had a hand in rejecting the verdict of the Daib-Dau-Laetsch Fiduciary Committee—certainly an unbiased committee—because its verdict was not favorable to the Board, I replied to the above letter under date of May 10 as follows:

"I regret to find it necessary to write you that I cannot accept the testimony of a conscience which disregarded the unanimous recommendation of a fiduciary committee—certainly an unbiased committee—and now thinks it proper, in spite of Christ's words in Matt. 5, 23-26, to meet the Christian obligation of proving a charge made in a private letter by saying, in effect, 'I shall be willing to prove the charge two or three years hence.' Whether the brethren of Synod will find it possible to accept such testimony will remain to be seen.

"I had hoped that all personal differences might be settled in a brotherly way in private. Since you, however, insist on having them taken before Synod, they will have to go before Synod."

Dr. Arndt's refusal to deal privately with a brother concerning a charge made by himself in private correspondence, and the utter futility of invoking a fiduciary committee in view of the Board's and Dr. Arndt's demonstrated unwillingness to accept a verdict of a committee when the verdict happens to be unfavorable to them, these are the reasons why the matter concerned in this correspondence is brought before Synod. Synod is therefore kindly asked:

1) to declare whether the attitude revealed by Dr. Arndt in his refusal to prove his charge made in private correspondence is consistent with scriptural precept and Christian brotherly love;

2) to demand of Dr. Arndt that he give to Synod a written proof of his charge of false doctrine.

VII

REFUSAL OF DR. ARNDT TO MAKE AMENDS FOR HIS MISREPRESENTATION OF FACTS

In a letter of Sept. 21, 1935, to Rev. W. O. Speckhard, Dr. Arndt stated with regard to me:

"That he was taken from the list of missionaries Nov. 30, 1932, was entirely due to his own action. I myself, in a plenary meeting of our Board, held in Oct., 1932, when we had conferred with Dr. Brux all day, made this proposition to him, that he should return to India and that in the meantime both he and we should continue to study the questions which we had debated, and that when he would return on furlough after seven years we should again hold a meeting and compare notes and see what conclusions we should have arrived at through further study. One of the warmest friends of Dr. Brux, at the Cleveland convention, when I mentioned this proposal, said publicly in the committee meeting that this was certainly fair. Unfortunately Dr. Brux turned down this offer, making a counter-proposal which was entirely unacceptable."

Rev. Speckhard, who had followed the case from its beginning and was acquainted with the official documents relating to the case, felt that this was a strange revelation of "fact" at this late date and in a letter of Sept. 26 asked: "Will you give me your side of this story?" In reply I sent Rev. Speckhard a copy of the following letter of Sept. 30, 1935, to Dr. Arndt:

"Through Rev. Speckhard of Clintonville, Wisconsin, who wrote to me in order to get my side of the story, I have learned that you have written him concerning the proposal made by you at the end of the plenary session of the Board on Oct. 11, 1932, and that you have represented the proposal thus [quoting in full the passage given above]:

"I must protest to you against this statement of yours as a grievous misrepresentation of facts, for the following reasons:

"1. You have failed to state the first and most important part of your proposition, namely *withdrawal of my paper*. This stipulation has always been a *conditio sine qua non* with you and the Board. It was made by you in the meeting referred to when you stated your proposition, and it has continued to be your stipulation down to Synod last June, when it was finally dropped. *Why have you not stated this important fact to Rev. Speckhard?*

"2. When in the Committee at Synod you made the statement referred to by you in your letter to Rev. Speckhard, I called your attention and that of the Committee, as well as of the visitors, to the fact that you had left out the most important item of your proposition, namely your stipulation for withdrawal of the paper. *This was done just as publicly as you claim that the brother's remark was made. Why do you now again choose to omit this item?*

"3. The statement in committee by a brother that this proposal as represented by you was certainly fair was made immediately after you had spoken the words and *before* I had the opportunity to call the attention of the brother and the others present to your omitting the stipulation for withdrawal of the paper. *Why do you relate the statement of the brother, but neglect to state also my objection to your omitting this most important item of your proposition?*

"4. Your own statement that my proposal of Nov. 5, 1932,* was entirely unacceptable is clear evidence that in your view and that of the Board the stipulation of withdrawal of the paper was *conditio sine qua non* with you and the Board.

"5. Even the proposition as you have related it to Rev. Speckhard is not correctly given as far as it goes. You did not say that 'in the meantime *both he and we* should continue to study the questions which we had debated, and that when he would return on furlough after seven years *we* should again hold a meeting and compare notes and see what conclusions *we* should have arrived at through further study, but clearly, as a corollary to your stipulation for withdrawal of the paper, that *I* had not considered the matter sufficiently yet and that *I* should give further study to the matter during the next seven years, when I would probably have changed my view, and that on the occasion of the next furlough we might discuss the matter again. *The willingness of the Board to study the matter further was not stated, as you now allege.*

"6. The ultimatum given by the Board in its resolution passed on Oct. 12, 1932, *the morning after your alleged proposition was made*, proves your allegation to be false. According to the minutes of the meeting (see copy of the official minutes, p. 15) I requested time to study the minutes and to consider carefully what step I should take, also with respect to your proposal. My reply to the Board under date of Oct. 29 and my proposal under date of Nov. 5 were the result of this deliberation. And the Board's resolution of Oct. 12 states: 'that we await the definite answer of Dr. Brux referred to in the foregoing, and that *if he continues to hold his present position*, his connection with our Board terminate Oct. 31, 1932, and that his salary cease Nov. 30, 1932.' *How can you square your allegation with this resolution which was adopted within fourteen hours after the proposal had been made by you?*

"Since by your statement to Rev. Speckhard you have clearly misrepresented the facts with regard to your proposition, and since you have done so after I had publicly called your attention to the omission of the stipulation for withdrawal of the paper, I am constrained to call on you, in a brotherly way, to apologize for doing this, and to inform Rev. Speckhard of the real facts in the matter."

In addition to the facts referred to in the foregoing letter it must be pointed out that the official minutes of the meeting of Oct. 11-12, 1935, *taken by Dr. Arndt himself, do not mention in any way the offer Dr. Arndt alleges he made;*

*In my letter to the Board of Nov. 5, 1932, in which I had made my proposal, I stated Dr. Arndt's proposal, by way of introduction, thus: "That I agree to withdraw my paper, to hold my views in abeyance, to make no propaganda for my views, and to practice in agreement with Synod's position" (i. e., as interpreted by the Board), and then submitted the following as a basis for a practical agreement pending disposition by Synod of the question under discussion:

"A. That my paper be placed before Synod, the manner in which this is to be done to be determined later by mutual consent.

"B. That the controversy between the Board and myself be declared dropped.

"C. That a scriptural *modus vivendi* be aimed at by the Board and myself pending disposal of the issue by Synod.

"D. That on the basis of Dr. Arndt's proposal, as understood by me, the following points of agreement be considered as furnishing such a Scriptural *modus vivendi*:

"1. That in order to avoid giving offense to my brethren in India and here, I agree to avoid unnecessary occasions for prayer-fellowship with Christians of other denominations, reserving, of course, the liberty to act in any situation according to my conscience, even as every pastor in Synod has, as a matter of principle in cases of casuistry, the liberty to act according to the dictates of his conscience.

"2. That I agree to refrain from making aggressive propaganda for my views on the mission field, provided no aggressive propaganda is there carried on against these views, it being understood, as a matter of course, that when the paper has been referred to Synod, I have full liberty to engage in the general discussion, be it in India or here."

on the contrary, they declare: "Dr. Brux stated that he still held that the views he presented in his paper were right, but that he would like to have an opportunity to study the minutes of the meeting before making a final statement. *One of the brethren remarked that as long as Brother Brux is holding a position at variance with that on which our Synod stands, we cannot send him back to the field.* The "withdrawal" of my paper, therefore, which was requested at the time when the above statement was made by "one of the brethren," was tantamount to a demand for recantation, as was amply proved by the resolution passed by Dr. Arndt and the Board on the following day (see above, par. 6). And rejection by the Board of my proposal of Nov. 5, 1932, *without giving any reason other than that it is unacceptable*, is further evidence that this was the case.

Under date of Oct. 19, 1935, Dr. Arndt replied to Rev. Speckhard and myself jointly:

"I have not answered your recent letters because through the action of Dr. Brux in taking the controversy to the President of Synod the whole discussion has entered a new stage, and it is not advisable that I write private letters on the question at issue before the President of Synod has acted. I merely wish to state that *Dr. Brux' version of the proposal which I made in Oct., 1932, with reference to his return to India is different from the one which I believe to be the correct one.*"

My answer of Oct. 30, 1935, stated:

"I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of Oct. 19 to Rev. Speckhard and myself, in which you decline to discuss the matter concerning which I felt it necessary to complain to you, alleging that 'it is not advisable that I write private letters on the question at issue before the President of Synod has acted.'"

"Frankly, I cannot concede the validity of the reason adduced. The matter complained of concerns you personally, not the B. F. M.; for the Board has never contended for what you say for yourself. My action against the Board is therefore independent of my complaint against you. Neither has the President of Synod anything to do with this matter as yet. The matter is strictly a private matter between you, Rev. Speckhard, and myself. I therefore renew, in a fraternal spirit, my request to you for satisfaction with respect to the complaint, pointing out that if you decline to do this in private, it will have to be done in public."

The meeting of Nov. 7, 1935, in Chicago, offered no opportunity for a personal talk with Dr. Arndt concerning this matter, and so it had to be continued by correspondence. Under date of Nov. 14, 1935, Dr. Arndt wrote to Rev. Speckhard and myself jointly:

"Since a joint meeting of Dr. Brux and representatives of the Mission Board under the chairmanship of President Behnken has been held—a meeting which was attended by several other interested brethren also—and since Dr. Brux is of the opinion that I should not cease writing to both of you, I shall write at least one more letter. I myself feel that there are two points on which I must write you, one having to do with my proposal made Oct., 1932, with respect to the return of Brother Brux to India, and the other dealing with the charge of false doctrine which we raise against the pamphlet of Brother Brux on Prayer-Fellowship.

"The chief item in the above-mentioned proposal of mine was that Dr. Brux should return to India, give further study to the question of prayer-fellowship, and that when he had come back for his next furlough we should

sit down together again and discuss the questions at issue. My proposal did *not involve any recantation or revocation*. Nor did any member of the Board insist that the proposal to be acceptable would have to involve a recantation. There was some discussion on the question whether Dr. Brux would not have to be asked to withdraw his essay for the time being, that is, withhold it from circulation (so I understood the remarks), and I think several speakers expressed the view that the essay should not be circulated during the interim. It is a point which I considered, and still consider, of altogether minor importance. The main thing was that the Board showed a willingness to return Dr. Brux to the field in order to give him further opportunity for considering the questions that were in debate, and that hence it cannot be said that we acted too hastily and showed an unconciliatory spirit."

Synod will kindly note (1) that Dr. Arndt is here changing his story, (2) that he is flatly contradicting the Board's resolution of Oct. 12, 1932, which stated that "we cannot return him to the field in India *if he does not recede from his position within the time stated*."

Under date of Nov. 16, 1935, Rev. Speckhard wrote to Dr. Arndt:

"Now as to your explanation of your letter in which you told me of the offer made to Brux in 1932. Even if you consider the condition (withdrawal of his paper) a minor one, I think you must admit that it was Brux' right to consider it a major one, for though you put the word in the best light (cease circulating his paper), it was his privilege to see its darker aspect, retraction of his position. . . . I do think that you ought in all fairness, when mentioning the offer that you made to Brux in 1932, add the condition that was attached to the offer. You conclude your remarks on this point by saying: 'Hence it cannot be said that we acted too hastily and showed an unconciliatory spirit.' Will you now with the same frankness and forthrightness that you have used in this letter answer these two questions: Do you think that the Mission Board did right in ignoring the pleas sent in by me and other brethren, asking that final action be postponed for a time, and taking note of them only *after* the action was taken and then only to explain why you took the action? I remember writing the Board at the time to this effect: 'What harm could delay in your decision do except to involve a few months' salary to Dr. Brux, and what good could your decision at this time effect except the saving of a few months' salary? To counterbalance which you have this harm which your decision at this time might well do: to publicly commit you in a way which will make modification or change of your position well-nigh impossible, and to offend sincere Christian brethren who in all uprightness and sincerity hold Brux to be right.' Now please answer this question unequivocally: Do you still believe it was right so to treat our pleas for delay?

"Secondly, do you still think it was right to ignore the report of the Confidential Committee, in which also the member representing the Mission Board concurred, namely that the case ought to be reopened? Surely, the personnel of the committee was sufficiently experienced to warrant a respectful hearing: Dr. Dau an eminent theologian and a former professor of Concordia Seminary (by the way, Dr. Dau wrote early this summer that he still stands unequivocally behind Dr. Brux), Rev. Daib, the Praeses of the N. Wis. District, and Prof. Laetsch, professor at Concordia Seminary. Did you feel at the time, and do you still feel, that to ignore, or, better, to disregard, that report was the right thing to do? It seems to me these questions enter vitally into the question whether the Board acted hastily and showed an unconciliatory spirit in the matter."

My own reply of Nov. 24, 1935, was as follows:

"Comparing the account of your proposal given in this letter with the account you gave to Rev. Speckhard some time back, I note a decided difference in the two accounts. The two accounts do not agree. Yet you do not indicate which of the two accounts we are to accept as true. You have not withdrawn your former account, and as a result both accounts are now lying before us and purport to be true, while it is obvious that only one of the two accounts can be true.

"Surely, as a Christian brother, you owe it both to Rev. Speckhard and to me to declare frankly which of the two accounts of your proposal you regard as a true representation of the facts and desire us to accept as such, and which you desire to withdraw and to have us regard as withdrawn. I would plead that you give us an unequivocal statement."

To this Dr. Arndt replied on Nov. 26, 1935, again jointly to Rev. Speckhard and myself:

"In reply to Dr. Brux' letter which arrived this morning, I wish to state that both of the accounts which I gave of my proposal pertaining to the return of Dr. Brux to India are correct, the one merely adding what I considered a minor detail which the other did not contain.

"With respect to the questions of Brother Speckhard, I wish to state that I did not, and do not now, consider the action which the Mission Board took wrong when it did not heed the plea of several brethren for postponement of action. Neither do I think that the Board's course was wrong when it did not follow the suggestion contained in the report of the Confidential Committee. Whether the course taken in both instances was wise is a question with which we are not now concerned. To thrash out these questions by correspondence is well-nigh impossible. I, however, am not averse at all to talking things over with you. I hope both, or either one, of you can come here for an oral discussion of everything involved. Perhaps President Behnken will arrange a meeting where all points at issue will be looked into. I am aware that I have not touched on a number of matters Pastor Speckhard alludes to or dwells on. My reply is so brief because I feel the futility of endeavoring to reach an understanding by correspondence."

Under date of Dec. 12, 1935, I replied:

"You claim that both accounts which you gave to Rev. Speckhard of your proposal with respect to my return to India are correct, and that the second account merely adds what you considered 'a minor detail' which the first account did not contain. As a matter of fact, your second account adds not only one detail, but several, all of which are of importance in revealing not only your attitude and that of the B. F. M. at the time the proposal was made, but also the palpable inconsistency of your two accounts.

"1. In your first account you stated the proposal thus (the important words are underlined by me): 'That he should return to India and that in the meantime he *and we should continue to study the questions* which we had debated, and that when he would return on furlough after seven years *we should again hold a meeting and compare notes and see what conclusions we should have arrived at through further study.*' In the second account you have left out all reference to further study on your part and that of the Board, and quite correctly state your proposal to have been 'that Dr. Brux return to India, give further study to the question of prayer-fellowship, and that when he had come back for his next furlough we should sit down together again and discuss the questions at issue.' Your further statement that this proposal was

made 'in order to give *him* further opportunity for considering the questions that were in debate' is additional evidence that you and the Board did not contemplate to study the questions yourselves—apparently you felt no need for that—but that you held that I alone had need for further study of the issues. I feel sure that you will be frank enough to admit that your two accounts on this point do not agree, and that your mere saying that 'both of the accounts . . . are correct' does not reconcile them. I therefore repeat my former question: Which of the two accounts do you wish us to accept as true?

"2. Your first account had no mention whatsoever of the stipulation of withdrawal of the paper, while your second account admits it. Whether you considered the stipulation of importance or not, whether you understood it as a demand for revocation or not, the stipulation was certainly an integral part of your proposal, as you yourself now acknowledge. Its omission in the first account, together with the wrongly alleged readiness on your part and that of the Board to join in studying the issue, gave to the first account of your proposal an entirely different tenor from that of the second, as Rev. Speckhard will testify. Surely, you will admit that the addition of such 'minor details' (as you are pleased to call them) as alter the tenor and meaning of an account are not of 'altogether minor importance,' but clearly make the two accounts inconsistent and make it impossible for you in honesty and fairness to claim that both accounts are correct. For I hesitate to believe that you hold that omission of a fact, combined with allegation of what is not a fact, by which the tenor of an account is materially altered, is in keeping with truth and honesty. I therefore repeat my former question: Which of the two accounts do you desire to have us accept as true?

"3. In this connection I would also point out to you that the interpretation which you now give to your proposal, namely that it 'did not involve any recantation or revocation,' and that the stipulation of withdrawal of the paper meant only to 'withhold it from circulation,' is clearly not in agreement with the following resolution passed by you and the Board within fourteen hours after your proposal was made and, in addition, at a time when you and the Board had agreed to give me time to consider the entire matter (which included also your proposal): 'Resolved that we cannot return him to the field in India if he does not recede from his position *within the time stated in his remarks as given in the minutes above*; resolved furthermore that we await the definite answer of Dr. Brux referred to in the foregoing, and that if he continues to hold his present position, his connection with our Board terminate Oct. 31, 1932, and that his salary cease Nov. 30, 1932.*'

"Will you be so kind as to explain to Rev. Speckhard and to me how you reconcile your interpretation of your proposal with the clear statements of this resolution?"

Rev. Speckhard's reply to Dr. Arndt's letter of Nov. 26, 1935, was:

"Thank you for the answer to two of my questions. I'm glad to know that you at least did not consider the course of the Mission Board in the matters referred to a wise one. I wish you could see that it was not right either. Particularly in the case of the Confidential Committee's report that seems to me so perfectly evident. All that report asked for was a reopening of the case. If even that was not granted it shows that the consent to such a committee was not sincere on the part of the Mission Board and that it from the

*It should be remembered that the minutes containing this resolution were written by Dr. Arndt as secretary of the B. F. M.

outset determined to ignore the report unless it happened to be favorable. The facts admit of no other explanation.

"Will you not answer the other questions of my letter? Even if completely satisfactory results can hardly be achieved without a personal interview, your answer to those questions would help me a great deal.

"As to your answer to Dr. Brux' letter, I can hardly believe that you consider it satisfactory. Even if you consider your omission in your first letter so slight as to be negligible, since you now see that Dr. Brux considers it exceedingly important, you ought in all fairness say that you regret it. Let me say frankly that if in your first letter to me, in which you mentioned that offer, you had at the same time added the condition (withdrawal of his paper), your offer would not have made upon me the impression that it did at that time. In so far you were guilty of creating a false impression even if you did not knowingly do so. But creating a false impression even innocently is a thing to be apologized for, or don't you think so?"

On Dec. 20, 1935, Dr. Arndt replied to Rev. Speckhard and myself thus:

"In reply to Dr. Brux' letter of Dec. 12, I wish to say that to the best of my knowledge and recollection both versions of my account pertaining to a proposal touching his return to India are correct, and that the thoughts contained in them were actually expressed.

"With respect to the question whether the resolution of the Board passed on the following day did not contradict or nullify the proposal, I can merely state that I do not think it did. Had Dr. Brux accepted the proposal, the Board might have considered that a sufficient modification of his stand to send him back to India. *Of course, this is a matter of conjecture.*"

In lieu of a brotherly righting of the wrong done Dr. Arndt merely reiterates his misrepresentation and offers surmise ("I think") and conjecture.

Rev. Speckhard replied under date of Dec. 27, 1935:

"Here is the case in its simple outlines. You wrote me a letter stating that you had proposed to Brux in 1932 that he return to India and give the matter of prayer-fellowship further study. Meanwhile the Board would do the same and then after seven years notes would be compared and an agreement sought. This offer, you stated, had in Cleveland made such a deep impression on one of Brux' friends that he said: 'That certainly was fair.' You intended that the offer should make the same impression upon me. It did surprise me somewhat, though I suspected, as I wrote you in my answer, that there was some reason for his refusal. . . . At the same time I said that I would write Brux to ascertain the reason for his refusal. He answered **that it was the condition attached by the Board to its offer, namely, that he withdraw his paper.** You admitted in your letter that some members of the Board said something about his withdrawing the paper. When Brux now complained to you about this omission and asked you to correct the false impression which you made upon me by reason of it, you answered that you considered the omission of such little importance that your first report of the offer made by the Board could be considered correct. How can you do that in the face of my assurance to you, made in a subsequent letter, that your version of the offer, had it contained the condition, would not have made upon me the impression which your version with the omission did? Don't you see that the important thing in this matter is not how you estimate the importance of the omission, but how the omission actually affected me? That you made **the omission unintentionally does not free you of all obligation to say: 'I'm sorry.'** If someone told me that by an unintentional omission on my part

in a statement concerning a third party I had made an impression upon him unfavorable to the third party, I would feel it my Christian duty to apologize to that someone and to that third party, even if only to say: 'I'm sorry.' Can't you see that?

"Besides don't you see the injustice you are doing to Brux? By saying that the condition made by the Board is not at all vital to the offer and need not be mentioned in connection with it, you set Brux down as one who rejected a generous offer without any reason whatever, when as a matter of fact his reason for rejecting the offer was the condition made by the Board. Again it doesn't matter what *you* think of that condition but what *he* thinks of it. If he considers the condition of such gravity (even if he wrongfully so considers it) as to compel him to refuse the offer of the Board, then his action has reason behind it. The other way it had none. Can't you see that?

"If your pride will not permit you to say to Brux: 'I'm sorry,' then answer this question for me. Do you hold that Brux rejected the offer of the Board without any reason adequate to his own conscience? Your version with the omission amounts to saying: 'Yes.' Shall that answer stand?" To this Dr Arndt replied under date of Jan. 7, 1936:

"This is not a matter of pride (the term which you use), but one of simple justice. I am not aware of having been guilty of intentional or unintentional misrepresentation. I am sorry, of course, that you drew conclusions which I did not have in mind. Furthermore, I am willing to say that since Dr. Brux regards the detail referring to the temporary shelving of his paper as essential, I am willing to incorporate it whenever in the future I should discuss this affair. *Further than this I cannot go.*" [Italics are mine.] In other words, Dr Arndt refuses to apologize.

Rev. Speckhard's answer of Jan. 10, 1936, was:

"I did not draw any conclusions at all. You wrote me that Dr. Brux had refused the offer of the Board to return him to India and you mentioned no reason why he had refused the offer. I wondered why he had refused the offer and wrote to him, and he replied that it was because the Board attached the condition that he withdraw his paper. Then I said that inasmuch as you knew of this condition (even if you considered it a wholly inadequate reason for refusing the offer) you should have mentioned it when mentioning the offer and its refusal, even as you now say in your letter that you are willing to do. Where are the conclusions that I have drawn?

"You are willing from now on to mention the temporary shelving of his paper whenever you mention the refusal of the offer, because you consider it the proper thing to do (and that is fine), yet you do not feel that you ought to have mentioned it in the first place. Really, I do not understand you. . . .

"Just one more question, then this incident is closed so far as I am concerned. Did Brux refuse the offer of the Board without giving any reason whatsoever? Just a letter or a card saying 'yes' or 'no' will be a sufficient reply." In reply Dr. Arndt stated under date of Jan. 14, 1936:

"In reply to your letter of Jan. 10, I wish to say that if my memory serves me right Dr. Brux said at our meeting in 1932 he would give my proposal further thought. A week or two later he wrote the Board about it. Since

I am not in possession of his letter, I cannot give all the details of it.* When you come here it may be worth while for us to get it out of the files in our Director's office. You are right: This correspondence is futile."

My own reply to Dr. Arndt's letter of Dec. 20, written on Jan. 14, 1936, stated:

"Your reply of Dec. 20, in which you continue to hold, in spite of the obvious facts and Rev. Speckhard's and my representations, that your two versions of your proposal are true, cannot but astonish, grieve, and offend Christian hearts. For your own sake and that of the church I wish that you would remove the offense. As matters stand now, further steps will need to be taken.

"Your explanation of the contradiction existing between the meaning which you attach to your proposal of Oct. 11, 1932, and the Board's resolution of Oct. 12, 1932, is, as you yourself admit, mere 'conjecture,' hence unsubstantiable surmise, and it will need to be rated accordingly and judged by the action of the Board in rejecting the unanimous recommendation of the Confidential Committee that the case be reopened. That action of the Board, too, has given great offense—a matter of which you and the Board can hardly be ignorant.

"With respect to the misrepresentation of your proposal of Oct. 11, 1932, in your letter to Rev. Speckhard of Sept. 21, 1935, I believe Rev. Speckhard and I have done what it is at present in our power to do personally to lead you to see and acknowledge the unbrotherly character of the misrepresentation involved."

The above correspondence clearly reveals Dr. Arndt, a member of Synod's B. F. M. and a teacher at our seminary, as grievously misrepresenting facts with regard to his attitude and that of the Board toward me on Oct. 11-12, 1932, and with regard to my attitude toward the Board's ultimatum given in its resolution of Oct. 12, 1932, and, in spite of documentary evidence brought to his attention that his allegations are wrong, in spite even of certain admissions on his part,

*My reply to the Board after having studied the minutes of the meeting of Oct. 11, 1932, and the Board's resolution of Oct. 12, 1932, was a detailed twelve-page document dated Oct. 29, 1932. In it I showed once more that the Board's exegesis of the Bible passages taken up at the meeting is untenable on the basis of the texts themselves, their contexts, and the parallel passages. I pointed out furthermore that with regard to the meaning of the chief passage, Rom. 16, 17-18, the members of the Board itself are of differing opinion and that I am at a loss to know which meaning I am to accept as scriptural from their point of view. My plea was: "I respectfully ask for proof, conclusive proof to show that my contention is untenable and the Board's view the only one that does justice to text and context" (pp. 8 f.), and stated: "Our attitude toward error and errorists must not be dictated by tradition, but my clear statements of Scripture, and it is my sincere aim to hold and practice the SCRIPTURAL attitude, not less than that, but also not more than that" (p. 10). In reply to the Board's resolution of Oct. 12 that I "recede" from my position or face dismissal I pointed out on the basis of our confessional writings (TRIGLOT, p. 777, 1-2, and 779, 8):

"The Holy Scriptures ALONE remain the only judge, rule and standard, according to which, as the ONLY test-stone, all dogmas shall and must be discerned and judged, as to whether they are good or evil, right or wrong." In the present case, the 'ACCEPTED Scriptural position of our Synod' has been challenged on the basis of SCRIPTURES, and in the resolution quoted above the Board, instead of appealing to clear words of Scripture, has had recourse to the 'ACCEPTED Scriptural position of our Synod,' a plain case of begging the question, and has undertaken to revoke a divine call to India not on Scriptural, but on 'ACCEPTED,' i.e. traditional grounds. In attempting to settle and dispose of my case in this fashion, the Board is reversing the Lutheran *modus procedendi* as laid down in our confessions and is in reality making the *norma normata*, the 'accepted Scriptural position of our Synod,' the *norma normans*. This, I say, is fundamentally un-Lutheran, and as a Lutheran I solemnly protest against it with every fibre of my being. Where has our Synod arrived at when such things as the resolution proposes are enacted by its representatives and forced down a dissenting person's throat as gospel from on high? Ought we not, in this Reformation season, in all humility consider the reformation needed in Missouri Synod?

"I conclude by humbly applying the words of Luther to my situation and offering them as my promised reply to the Board, viz.: 'Unless I am convinced by the testimony of Scripture or by clear reasoning—for I believe neither the Pope nor the councils alone since it is clear as the day that they have frequently erred and contradicted each other—I am held convinced by the passages of Holy Writ I have adduced and my conscience is bound by that Word of God. Recant I cannot and will not, because it is unsafe and dangerous to act against conscience.'" [In the letter this quotation from Luther was given in German.]

as refusing to do what fairness and brotherly love require. I appeal to Synod to lead Dr. Arndt to acknowledge the unbrotherliness of his action and to make Christian amends for it.

VIII

DETAILS OF PROCEDURE ADOPTED AGAINST ME BY DR. BRAND, THE B. F. M., AND DR. PFOTENHAUER PRIOR TO MY APPEAL IN 1934

Since the amicable settlement achieved at Cleveland has been frustrated and overthrown by Dr. Brand, the B. F. M., and Dr. Pfotenhauer, as was set forth in chapters i-v, it is clear that only a judicial investigation and settlement can now dispose of the case, likewise that the judicial investigation will need to concern itself also with the procedure adopted by Dr. Brand, the B. F. M., and Dr. Pfotenhauer against me prior to my appeal in 1934. For the benefit of those who received my printed *Appeal* but have since destroyed it, as well as for those who did not receive it, I repeat here the summary of charges given in the *Appeal* on pp. 4-6.

A. Charges against Dr. Brand and the B. F. M.:

1. The important document of March 10, 1932, with covering letter of March 11, 1932, in which I had set forth that my position on prayer-fellowship with Christians of other denominations is in perfect keeping with fundamental principles officially held by Synod and stated in Dr. Walther's theses of 1868 (*Lehre und Wehre*, 1868, pp. 318, 319), while the current theory and practice of Synod constitutes an inconsistency in the application of these principles, was ignored, was never taken up for discussion in our meetings, and is left unanswered to this day. (History,* pp. 8, 9, 18, 21.)

2. The ouster resolution of May 16, 1932, which grossly distorts my position, was framed and passed without a proper study of my paper, on the basis of one-sided and therefore unfair excerpts made and presented by Dr. Brand. (History, pp. 8, 9.)

3. My protest of July 11 against the misrepresentation of my position in the resolution of May 16, 1932, was never replied to. (History, pp. 10-11.)

4. The written refutation of my paper, which was requested in the meeting of the Plenary Board in Milwaukee on June 14, 1932, was not given. (History, pp. 9f., 12, 15.)

5. The *first* official statement of the Board on Rom. 16, 17-18, found in the minutes of the meeting of the Plenary Board of Oct. 11, 1932, was given *four months after the resolution of May 16, 1935, had already been passed by the St. Louis Board*. (History, p. 13.)

6. This first official statement of the Board on Rom. 16, 17-18 was not given as a fraternal presentation of its understanding of the Scriptures, but came backed by an *ultimatum* passed on Oct. 12, 1932, which peremptorily declared my dismissal if I would not recant, thus announcing the Board's unwillingness to consider further evidence, scriptural or otherwise, that I might feel duty-bound to bring to their attention. (History, p. 13.)

7. While in the meeting of Oct. 11, 1932, Rom. 16, 17-18 was quite thoroughly discussed, a discussion of the other Bible passage was refused. (History, pp. 12 f.)

8. The resolutions of Oct. 12, 1932, fail to specify the charge properly, but generalize the charge into a vague departure from the "accepted scriptural position of our Synod," without defining what, in the mind of the Board, that position is,

*The references under each item to "History" are to "History of the Case," which constituted pp. 6-31 of my printed APPEAL issued in 1934.

for example, whether or not it forbids private prayer-fellowship, whether or not it definitely excludes prayer at so-called "free" conferences with Ohio, Iowa, etc., and the like. A charge is made, but the principal term of the charge ("*accepted Scriptural position of our Synod*") is not defined, and the nature of the departure therefore not made specific. (History, p. 13.)

9. The resolutions do not charge violation of the *Scriptures* but violation of the *accepted scriptural position of Synod*, that is, violation of the *accepted interpretation and application of the Scriptures, and thereby place human interpretation and agreement on such interpretation above the Scriptures themselves*. (History, pp. 13f, 21-23.)

10. The resolutions aim to deprive me of my divine call to India on the ground of departing from the "*accepted scriptural position of our Synod*," yet fail to mention a single Bible passage allegedly violated by me. (History, p. 13.)

11. In lieu of Scripture proof, the resolutions adduce as proof positive of my guilt and as warrant for my dismissal merely the Board's own admitted failure to bring convincing proof ("since our long continued efforts to convince him of the error of his position have been unavailing"). (History, p. 13.)

12. My communication of Oct. 29, 1932, in which I set forth the untenability of the Board's interpretation of Rom. 16, 17-18 as found in the minutes of the Board meeting of Oct. 11, was ignored. (History, pp. 13-15.)

13. My protest against being judged by the *accepted* position of Synod rather than by the *Scriptures alone*, contained in my communication of Oct. 29, 1932, was ignored. (History, pp. 13-15.)

14. The proposals made in my communication of Nov. 5, 1932, were rejected without giving a proper reason or making a reasonable counter-proposal. (History, p. 14.)

15. The protests of many brethren were ignored inasmuch as no attempt was made by the Board and its General Secretary to deal with the protesting brethren before putting the protested resolution into effect, and a fundamental principle in cases of church discipline was thus violated. (History, p. 15.)

16. The fair and just pleas contained in my communication of Dec. 8, 1932, were rejected. (History, pp. 15-17, 19.)

17. The letter of Dec. 8, 1932, from the Board and its General Secretary concerning publication of notice of my suspension from office constitutes an overstepping of the authority conferred on the Board and its General Secretary by Synod and an infringement on the power of the District President. (History, pp. 17, 20 f.)

18. The Board and its General Secretary, in their "Statement" of Dec. 8, 1932, to the protesting brethren, misrepresented their own efforts to understand and refute my position and misrepresented the point of controversy. (History, pp. 18, 19.)

19. The Board and its General Secretary, in the "Second Statement," issued under date of March 27, 1933, by declaring "We are not willing to admit that one has to read his essay in order to establish whether his doctrinal position is right or wrong," espouses a most unfair and unjust principle for judging a brother's doctrinal and practical position. (History, p. 21f.)

20. The Board and its General Secretary consumed an inordinate and unwarranted amount of time in procuring their representative on the Confidential Committee, and again in giving a reply after receipt of the Confidential Committee's report. (History, pp. 21, 24.)

21. The Board and its General Secretary rejected the unanimous recommendation of the Confidential Committee, which obviously was based on the require-

ments of fairness and justice, for an utterly inadequate and improper reason, namely, the wholly subjective opinion that they deem further negotiations to be "unpromising." (History, p. 24.)

22. The Board and its General Secretary, by canceling my call to India, are interfering with a divine call, because a divine call can be declared void only on positive proof of unscriptural doctrine or faulty life, neither of which has been proved. (History, pp. 24f.)

23. The Board and its General Secretary rejected the overture of the officials of the South Wisconsin District for a reopening of the case on the improper plea that the case "no longer belongs before our forum," on the wrongly alleged ground of having dealt "sufficiently patiently, frequently, and untiringly," and on the unproved assumption that my position is "error," and did so in spite of the fact that two members of the Board were for a reopening. (History, pp. 26 f.)

24. Though the members of the Board of Foreign Missions are themselves not of one mind on Rom. 16, 17-18 and other relevant Bible passages, the Board and its General Secretary have nevertheless refused to do what Christian fairness and justice clearly require in such a situation, viz. rescind the ouster resolution of Oct. 12, 1932, but on the contrary have continued to make unfair stipulations for retraction. (History, pp. 29-31.)

B. Charges against Dr. Pfotenhauer:

1. The President of Synod counseled the Board of Foreign Missions to reject the recommendation of the Fiduciary Committee and thereby violated the most obvious requirements of Christian fairness and justice. (History, p. 26.)

2. The President of Synod has refused to discuss with me the injustice of the Board's procedure against me. (History, p. 24.)

3. The President of Synod, when approached by other brethren, has repeatedly declined to act in the interest of just procedure. (History, pp. 26, 27.)

4. The President of Synod, by declaring me unrecommendable or ineligible for office before the College of Presidents *before* the case had been submitted to the officials of the South Wisconsin District, has violated the Synodical Constitution and its By-Laws (Synodical Handbook, p. 6, Art. XI, par. 1; p. 19, par. 4), which confer authority to declare a pastor unrecommendable or ineligible on the district presidents only (Synodical Handbook, p. 27 E; also p. 9, par. 8), and has thereby unjustly created harmful prejudice against me. (History, p. 21.)

IX

SUMMARY OF PLEAS MADE TO SYNOD IN THIS RE-APPEAL

On the basis of the foregoing statement of my case against Dr. Brand, the B. F. M., Dr. Pfotenhauer, and Dr. Arndt I respectfully and fraternally plead that Synod carefully review the entire case and give an unequivocal verdict with regard to the following points:

1. Does the action and attitude of Dr. Brand, the B. F. M., and Dr. Pfotenhauer after settlement of the case by Synod at Cleveland in 1935 constitute a violation of that settlement (a) as regards the doctrinal agreement incorporated in the Report adopted by Synod; (b) as regards my reinstatement as missionary to India, with all that this implies?

2. Were the procedure and action of Dr. Brand, the B. F. M., and Dr. Pfotenhauer prior to my first appeal to Synod (for a summary of details involved see pp. 54-56) in keeping with Christian brotherly love in general and, in particular, with Synod's Constitution, which pledges the protection of pastors, teachers, and congregations in the performance of their duties [which certainly include the duty

to bear witness to scriptural truth and to call attention to unscriptural doctrine and practice on the part of its representatives] and the maintenance of their rights" (Art. III 8), and declares that "all matters of doctrine and of conscience shall be decided only by the Word of God" (Art. VIII C)?

3. Is Dr. Arndt's refusal to prove in writing the charge of heresy which he raised against me in private correspondence with Rev. Speckhard and myself after the doctrinal issue had been settled by Synod in keeping with Christian brotherly love?

4. Is Dr. Arndt's misrepresentation of facts to Rev. Speckhard and his refusal to make Christian amends in keeping with Christian brotherly love?

APPENDIX

REVIEW OF DR. ARNDT'S POSITION ON PRAYER-FELLOWSHIP AS PRESENTED ON PP. 60-67 OF HIS "CHRISTIAN PRAYER" (ST. LOUIS, 1937)

After the preceding *Re-appeal* had been written, my attention was called to Dr. Arndt's recent booklet entitled *Christian Prayer*. The "Foreword" states: "This essay originally was prepared for, and read at, the convention of the Oklahoma District of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States held in Lahoma, Oklahoma, May, 1937. The request of the convention, addressed to Concordia Publishing House, to have the essay printed was acted on favorably by the Literature Board of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States and by the Board of Directors of Concordia Publishing House." The booklet therefore purports to be an official utterance of Missouri Synod, and its last chapter (pp. 60-67), in which Dr. Arndt sets forth his position on prayer-fellowship with Christians not of the Synodical Conference, is no doubt meant to appear as an official statement of Synod with regard to that question. However, a careful study of this chapter reveals that the position taken by Dr. Arndt is not in agreement with the statement on prayer-fellowship accepted by Synod in 1935—unquestionably the truly official position of Synod until Synod in convention should choose to alter it—although Dr. Arndt, the brethren of the Oklahoma District, and Synod's Literature Board apparently labor under the impression that it is in agreement. But however that may be, the plain fact is that the position on prayer-fellowship with Christians differing from us in some point of nonfundamental doctrine, as Dr. Arndt has presented it in his booklet, is essentially the position held by Dr. Brand, the B. F. M., and Dr. Pfotenhauer, *which, by implication, was rejected by Synod in 1935* (see *Re-appeal*, pp. 33-37). It is the purpose of the following review of the last chapter of Dr. Arndt's booklet to call Synod's attention to this anomalous situation and to furnish proof that Dr. Arndt's presentation on prayer-fellowship with Christians not affiliated with the Synodical Conference is unscriptural and in conflict with the doctrinal statement on prayer-fellowship adopted by Synod in 1935. The review follows Dr. Arndt's presentation paragraph by paragraph.

1. Page 60, par. 1. Dr. Arndt has quite rightly begun the chapter on prayer-fellowship by showing that "*joint prayer is inculcated by God and given a special promise.*" One wonders though why he has not also stressed the truth which necessarily follows from the divine inculcation and promise, namely that *joint prayer with fellow-Christians is therefore meant by God to be the normal thing in Christian life and hence may not lightly be discontinued or refused.* As one reads the following paragraphs of the chapter, the reason for his not even mentioning this corollary becomes quite apparent: it is that this truth runs counter to his:

purpose, which is to show that *prayer-fellowship with Christians outside of the Synodical Conference is a priori disbarred by reason of existing differences in non-fundamental doctrines*. The failure to mention the corollary is therefore very significant.—What he states thematically with regard to barriers against joint prayer will be taken up in the discussion of the following paragraphs.

2. Page 61, par. 1. Naturally, Christian prayer-fellowship may be practiced by Christians only. Dr. Arndt has put it well in the words: "Those with whom I am to pray must belong to the holy Christian church, the communion of saints. All who are members of this church, the so-called invisible church, are united with each other by the unseen bond of faith in the divine Savior. Where there is no evidence of the existence of this unseen bond, there is no justification for prayer-fellowship." Strangely, however, Dr. Arndt has failed to state the converse, which is equally true, namely that *where there is evidence of the existence of this unseen bond there is justification for prayer-fellowship, nay not only justification, but God's inculcation and divine promise* (see preceding paragraph). Again, why the silence on this positive truth? The reason appears in the following sentence: "What we think of primarily when we here speak of evidence is of course the profession people make of their religious convictions, a profession the truthfulness and sincerity of which no one except the person making it and the omniscient God can in all cases determine." What Dr. Arndt means by this rather vague statement comes to the surface in the subsequent argumentation, where he speaks of the members of Christian churches outside of the Synodical Conference not as *Christians*, albeit weak in doctrine, but as *nominal* Christians concerning whose true Christianity we must remain in doubt because we are not "omniscient" (p. 65) and hence not "readers of men's hearts" (p. 66). In other words, Dr. Arndt holds that in the case of members of Christian churches that hold to the foundation, Christ, but deviate from us in their doctrinal profession, that is, in nonfundamental doctrines, the evidence of the existence of the unseen bond of faith that unites all believers in Christ in the one holy Christian church, the communion of saints, is *lacking and that there is therefore a priori no justification for prayer-fellowship*. And thus the doctrine of the universal Christian church, which he had just before stated so beautifully, is in effect canceled and negated by the unscriptural assumption that we may not in charity regard them as our Christian brethren on the basis of their profession of the fundamental Christian faith, but need, in addition to a confession of Christ as Redeemer, the assurance of their complete orthodoxy or of their willingness to receive *us* as their instructors. If the Christian church bodies outside of the Synodical Conference were to set up such a claim for themselves over against us, we would be the first to point out that such an attitude is not in keeping with the scriptural doctrine of the universal church since it makes stipulations for regarding a person as a Christian which the Scriptures themselves do not make. According to the Scriptures, faith in Christ as Redeemer constitutes a person a member of the universal church (John 8, 31-32 taken in its context, where "my word" refers to Christ's proclamation of Himself as Savior from sin and death; also Acts 4, 12; 5, 14; 10, 43; 16, 31). This membership continues and should be acknowledged as long as the individual Christian is built on the one and only foundation, Christ, even though errors in non-fundamentals are mistakenly held or taught by him (1 Cor. 3, 10-15). Error and weakness in Christian knowledge are in this life unavoidable, as the epistles of the New Testament amply illustrate. In spite of this the Christians should endeavor to keep the unity established by the Spirit in the bond of peace, keeping in mind the fundamentals of the Christian faith that unite them (Eph. 4, 1-6),

and should strive to grow unto the measure of the full maturity of Christ (Eph. 4, 11-16). Unity in nonfundamentals, that is, in doctrines and attitudes which do not affect the foundation, faith in Christ as Redeemer, is the goal of Christian life, not the necessary condition for regarding persons as living members of the universal church (1 Cor. 1, 10; 3, 1-23). Hence Paul addressed the believers in the local congregations in Ephesus, Colossae, Philippi, Thessalonica, Corinth, and Rome, among whom several erroneous doctrinal tendencies in nonfundamentals were represented, as *members of the universal church*, as saints in Christ (Eph. 1, 1; Col. 1, 1; Phil. 1, 1), the church in God the Father and in the Lord Jesus Christ (1 Thess. 1, 1; 2 Thess. 1, 1), "them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus; called to be saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours" (1 Cor. 1, 2), etc., etc. Similarly Peter in 1 Pet. 1, 1, 2 and 2 Pet. 1, 1. Paul showed furthermore that he believed this of all Christians of the various local congregations (compare Phil. 1, 7: "Even as it is meet for me to think this of you all"), unless he had clear evidence of loss of faith in Christ (1 Tim. 1, 19, 20) or of wicked life with which faith in Christ could not possibly exist (1 Cor. 5, 11-13; Phil. 3, 18, 19). The apostles could look into the hearts of the Christians to ascertain the presence of real faith as little as we can. *But wherever Christ was confessed as Lord and as Savior from sin, and a life consistent with such faith was led, they charitably assumed and believed the actual existence of membership in the spiritual and invisible church, and they also acted on this assumption and belief by addressing the persons concerned as "saints," "the church of God . . . sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours," fellowshiping with them and leaving the judgment of the individual hearts to God (2 Tim. 2, 19).*

Dr. Arndt's position, then, is clearly not apostolic and scriptural. But neither is it Lutheran. In the Augsburg Confession (Art. VII, par. 2; *Triglöt*, p. 47) it is stated, on the basis of Eph. 4, 5, 6: "And to the true unity of the church it is enough to agree concerning the doctrine of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments." And the Apology (par. 20; *Triglöt*, pp. 232 f.) unambiguously defines "the pure doctrine of the gospel and the sacraments" as "the foundation" referred to by Paul in 1 Cor. 3, 11 ("Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ"), that is, as "the true knowledge of Christ and faith," and expressly takes doctrinal errors which do not overthrow the foundation into account as matters that "are both forgiven them and also corrected," hence as matters which do not destroy the requisite fundamental unity of the church spoken of in the Augsburg Confession.

On this entire subject see further *Christian Prayer-Fellowship and Unionism*, pp. 43-47, 61-64, and 71-94.

3. Page 61, par. 2. On reading this paragraph in Dr. Arndt's booklet one cannot refrain from asking in surprise: Has anybody ever claimed that the mere possession or presentation of the name Christian on the part of a person, though he lead a faith-destroying sinful life as in the case referred to in 1 Cor. 5, should justify our engaging in prayer-fellowship with him? If not, why introduce the case? Paul clearly indicates in 1 Cor. 5, 13 that the person in question and such as may be guilty of the sins mentioned in v. 11, if they do not repent and reform, are to be "put away from among yourselves," that is, *excommunicated and no longer to be regarded as Christians*.

4. Page 62, par. 1. See remarks on the preceding paragraph.

5. Page 62, par. 2. Dr. Arndt's thesis that sins which are not in themselves

faith-destroying, if persisted in, erect a barrier against prayer-fellowship is not upheld by 2 Thess. 3, 6-15, as he claims; on the contrary, Paul's cautioning words: "Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother," clearly imply that religious fellowship—and that certainly includes prayer-fellowship—*should not be discontinued but maintained, and this even in the case of such as "obey not our word by this epistle," that is, of such as continue to persist in their disorderly conduct.* And that is after all the only course that is in accord with Christian brotherly love when the sin is not in itself faith-destroying and persistence in it is due to lack of Christian knowledge or to misguidance, as was the case in Thessalonica. The stressing of this important fact by Paul in vss. 14-15 should have warned Dr. Arndt not to put a meaning into "withdraw yourselves from" (v. 6) and "have no company with" (v. 14) that violates both the words and the spirit of the evangelical injunction: "Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother." But even apart from this, a study of the phrases "withdraw yourselves from" and "have no company with" in their given context here and also in parallel passages reveals that these phrases do not mean what Dr. Arndt says they mean.

a) The Greek word for "withdraw yourself from" (*stellesthai hymas apo*) is used in the New Testament in this one place only. Vss. 7-13 state the motive (note the word "for" in vss. 7, 10, and 11) that should guide them in "withdrawing," namely to follow Paul's example (vss. 7-10) and untiringly to do the right thing themselves (v. 13); in other words, *they were to refrain from joining in the disorderly conduct of the "busybodies" and by their own good example in following Paul to influence the erring brethren.*

b) The word "have no company with" (*mae synanamignysthe*) occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only twice, namely in 1 Cor. 5, 9 and 11: "I wrote unto you in an epistle not to *company with* fornicators; yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous or extortioners, or with idolators; for then must ye needs go out of the world. But now I have written unto you *not to keep company* if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolator, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; *with such an one no not to eat.*" In v. 11 the word "to have no company with" is clearly used of *Christian social intercourse* as distinguished, on the one hand, from social intercourse with the world in general (vss. 9 f.) and, on the other hand, from *religious fellowship* (v. 13: "put away from among yourselves that wicked person"). The emphatic statement: "No not to eat," points in the same direction and clearly indicates that Paul wishes the injunction to be understood of *Christian social intercourse* since such intercourse would lead non-Christians to believe that Christians countenance such conduct or do not regard it as a serious moral fault. What the Corinthian Christians are to do concerning *Christian religious fellowship* with such a person as is referred to in 1 Cor. 5 is clearly stated in v. 13: "Put away from yourselves that wicked person," that is, excommunicate him, if unrepentant. In 1 Cor. 5, 9, 11 Paul therefore urges a twofold duty on the Corinthians: (1) to break off *Christian social intercourse* with a fornicator "that is called a brother," as soon as the deed has become known, which is enjoined in the words "keep no company with"; (2) to break off *Christian religious fellowship* if repentance is not forthcoming, which is enjoined in v. 13: "Put away from yourselves that wicked person."

Turning now to 2 Thess. 3, 14, we note that Paul here uses the phrase "have no company with" *in exactly the same sense and with exactly the same restriction* as he does in 1 Cor. 5, 9, 11, that is, of *Christian social intercourse* as distinguished from *religious fellowship*, reserving his counsel regarding religious fellowship for

the following verse: "Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother." In other words, the phrase to "have no company with" is used in the same sense as "withdraw yourselves from" in v. 6, that is, negatively, of abstaining from joining, or from appearing to join, in the conduct of the disorderly brethren and, positively, of steadfastly setting a good example in following Paul in order to lead the erring brethren to see their wrong and to desist from it, or, as Paul puts it, "that they may be ashamed."

c) The fact that Paul, in contrast to his attitude toward the offender in 1 Cor. 5, here continues to call the disorderly persons brethren (v. 6) and urges the Thessalonians to regard and to treat them as such (v. 15) clearly indicates that he wishes his injunction to "withdraw" and to "have no company with" to be carried out *without disbarring them from Christian religious fellowship* (which certainly includes prayer-fellowship), for this was the most potent means at their command to lead the erring brethren to see aright (noutheteite). *Even the disobedient and recalcitrant idlers (v. 14) are not to be removed from the influence of the brethren, but are to be kept under it for loving correction and appeal.* To disbar the erring brethren from worship or prayer-fellowship would have frustrated the very thing that Paul aimed to achieve: the winning of these *brethren*—true brethren though weak—away from their wrong views. For a more detailed study of this passage see *Christian Prayer-Fellowship and Unionism*, pp. 28-31.

A careful study of 2 Thess. 3, 6-15 therefore shows not only that Dr. Arndt's interpretation and application of this passage is untenable, but that the passage actually declares the very opposite of what Dr. Arndt claims, namely that *religious fellowship*—and that certainly will include prayer-fellowship—is not to be disbarred in such cases where wrong conduct that is not in itself faith-destroying is persisted in through lack of proper Christian knowledge or because of misguidance by others. And this will hold, by analogy, also for cases of doctrinal error where the fundamentals of faith are not overthrown. *There can be no doubt that in Paul's mind the disorderly conduct of some of the Thessalonians was merely a weakness, otherwise he would not have enjoined treatment as brethren for even those who "obey not our word by this epistle."* Hence, when Dr. Arndt says "that there are cases of sinning where it is apparent that what would normally act as a barrier to prayer-fellowship is merely a weakness, which we must patiently bear with, and that in general an unbrotherly, unevangelical, legalistic procedure must be avoided should not be overlooked," *he declares as exceptions what Paul sets forth as the general principle for this and all similar cases.* Furthermore, on the basis of his own interpretation Dr. Arndt is inconsistent and in violation with the very passage he has adduced. For if in 2 Thess. 3, 6-15 Paul really meant to say of the weak Thessalonian brethren that "for the time that it lasted, their sin severed the ties of fellowship," as Dr. Arndt claims, what right has Dr. Arndt to correct Paul and say that this does not hold in all cases and that a pastor may or may not follow the divine injunction as he sees fit? Either Paul *forbids* prayer-fellowship in the passage under consideration, or he does *not* forbid it; but never may a pastor say: "It is forbidden," and then proceed to make exceptions according to his pastoral liking.

6. Page 63, par. 1. True, with a drunkard one should proceed as Dr. Arndt suggests, because drunkenness, according to 1 Cor. 5, 11-13, is a so-called mortal sin and, if not repented of, definitely negates a person's claim to being a Christian. But that "sins which are not faith-destroying in themselves will, if persisted in, make prayer-fellowship impossible," as Dr. Arndt claims, is *not* true. For he bases this claim on 2 Thess. 3, 6-15, a passage which, if it means anything (see dis-

cussion in preceding paragraph), enjoins that as long as we must assume that the persistence in such sins is due to weakness in Christian knowledge or to misguidance religious fellowship, and hence prayer-fellowship, should *not* be discontinued.

7. Page 63, par. 2. The analogy between sinful life and error in doctrine is granted, provided that the distinction between fundamental and nonfundamental (not faith-destroying) doctrines is carried through in the same way as the distinction between faith-destroying sins and sins that are not faith-destroying is held. But the apparently assumed applicability of 1 John 4, 1 to Christians of other denominations that stand on the foundation, Christ, must emphatically be denied. For such Christians are *not* "false prophets" in the sense in which John uses this term, as vss. 2-3 clearly show: "Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: *every spirit that confesseth that Jesus is come in the flesh is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God, and this is that spirit of antichrist whereof ye have heard that it should come, and even now already is it in the world.*" If Dr. Arndt means to apply this passage to fundamentalist Christians outside of the Synodical Conference because they differ from us in some nonfundamental doctrines, as he appears to do, why does he ignore this context? Are not vss. 2-3 as important as v. 1? And does not neglect of context lead to "adding to" or "subtracting from" the scriptural message—a thing which Dr. Arndt himself condemns severely in the next paragraph on the basis of Rev. 22, 18f.? As for the case of the Methodist posited by Dr. Arndt, it may be stated briefly that the Methodist's statement amounts to an invitation to *unionistic* prayer-fellowship, which would have to be denied on the ground of involving *unionism*, not because the posited Methodist is a "false prophet."

The last sentence of the paragraph: "Whether the two . . . prayer-fellowship will depend on developments in the conversation," is true enough, but for Dr. Arndt it involves a contradiction similar to the one noted at the end of paragraph 5. For if, as Dr. Arndt seems to imply, 1 John 4, 1 applies to the posited Methodist, then he cannot be regarded as a Christian. It is interesting, however, to note that Dr. Arndt does not deny the *possibility* of prayer-fellowship with the posited Methodist, the latter's difference on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper notwithstanding. By his own admission, then, difference in doctrine that is not faith-destroying need not be a barrier to prayer-fellowship. Unfortunately Dr. Arndt does not enlighten his readers on the "developments in the conversation" which would lead him to pray with the Methodist.

8. Page 64, par. 1. Here Dr. Arndt undertakes to prove, on the basis of Matt. 28, 20 and John 8, 31-32, "that adherence to false doctrine is a barrier to prayer-fellowship." Since Dr. Arndt is here referring to *Christians*, that is, to such as stand on Christ, the true foundation, we must assume that by "false doctrine" he means false doctrine in nonfundamentals. But the Bible passages cited do not substantiate his claim. For while Matt. 28, 20 ("teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you") enjoins that Christians are to be faithful in teaching the whole compass of Christ's doctrine, *it does not declare either by direct words or by implication that holding to a mistaken understanding of His words should disbar Christians from prayer-fellowship*, and no interpretation laying claim to fairness can deduce from this passage what Dr. Arndt deduces from it. As for John 8, 31-32, a careful study of this passage with its preceding and following context reveals clearly that in vss. 31-32 Christ is referring not to the entire compass of Christian doctrine as it now exists in the New Testament, but to the central doctrine of Christianity, acceptance of Christ as Redeemer. The passage was spoken, as v. 31 indicates, "to those Jews which believed in Him."

Their faith had just been kindled as they listened to Jesus' discourse in vss. 21-29, in which He had presented Himself to the Jews as their Savior from sin and death and as the Father's messenger in declaring Himself as such. "As he spake *these words*," the Evangelist tells us in vss. 30-32, "many believed on Him. Then [better: therefore] said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him. If ye continue in my word [this just mentioned word of mine], then are ye my disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Continue in what? Certainly in what they had just heard and in what they now believed. To expand the meaning of "my word" to embrace the entire compass of Christian doctrine is to create an impossible situation; for one can continue or *abide* in that only which one has accepted. In the present case, the Jews referred to had accepted Christ's message to them as stated in vss. 21-29, and "continue in" can therefore have reference to *this only*, not to the entire body of Christian doctrine, which at that time had not yet been revealed. This is fully corroborated by the following context, vss. 33-59, where Jesus tries repeatedly to drive home the gospel message: Jesus the God-sent Savior from sin and death. A detailed discussion of John 8, 21-59 will be found in *Christian Prayer-Fellowship and Unionism*, pp. 55-58.

The use which Dr. Arndt makes of John 8, 31-32 is therefore in clear violation of the text and its preceding and following context and leads him to set up perfection in doctrine as a necessary condition of prayer-fellowship. Even a deviation from the teaching of Jesus that "may be unknown" to a person and "not at all deliberate" is for Dr. Arndt a "barrier to prayer-fellowship." What a far cry from Dr. Walther, who stated: "*Never has the church attained a higher degree of unity in doctrine than a unity in fundamentals, and only a fanatical chiliast could hope that the church would ever reach a higher degree. So long as the church remains in the flesh, this is as impossible as that it should be perfect in life and in love (Lehre und Wehre, 1868, p. 66).*" "We are far from desiring to discontinue fraternal fellowship with an individual person, or church fellowship with a church body, if these are not dogmatically correct in their Christian knowledge. By no means do we regard such correctness as a condition of such fellowship. If we would do that, we would have to contend against ourselves, for while we note such faults, that is, errors, in others, they again may note such in the one or the other among us" (*ibid.* pp. 110 f.). If the facts stressed by Dr. Walther are true, how can Dr. Arndt claim that "adherence to false doctrine is a barrier to prayer-fellowship"? If Dr. Arndt's claim is true, would prayer-fellowship then not have to cease throughout the Christian church? If unintentional deviation from scriptural doctrine in nonfundamentals does not disbar from membership in the universal Christian church, why must it be a barrier to prayer-fellowship?

At the end of the paragraph Dr. Arndt attempts to clinch his argument by adducing Rev. 22, 18-19. His remarks in the middle of the paragraph about "adding here, subtracting there, altering this or that teaching" indicate that he had this passage in mind when speaking there of deviations from the teaching of Jesus that "may be unknown" to a Christian and "not at all deliberate." As if John in his warning words Rev. 22, 18-19 had such cases in mind and with reference to them declared: "God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book . . . God shall take away his part out of the book of life . . . !" That even unintentional error should not be ignored is true enough. But that fact does not, according to the Scriptures, warrant the claim that adherence to such error is a barrier to prayer-fellowship, least of all does it give Dr. Arndt the right to throw intentional and unintentional error into the same pot and to apply Rev. 22, 18-19 to both alike. Let us hope that Synod will repudiate the unscriptural position which Dr. Arndt is here proclaiming in its name.

9. Page 65, par. 1. In this paragraph Dr. Arndt seeks to prove the scripturalness of his thesis that "false doctrine is a barrier to prayer-fellowship" from "another point of view," that of Rom. 16, 17: "Mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned and avoid them." These words, Dr. Arndt holds, apply not only to *teachers* of false doctrines but also to any "adherent of such principles" inasmuch as such "help to continue the divisions which these teachings have caused." His reference to Roger Williams and the present-day Baptists indicates, furthermore, that he has in mind not only such as deny the fundamental doctrines of Christianity and hence may not be regarded as Christians at all, but above all *Christian* teachers and their *Christian* adherents who err in some doctrine that is not faith-destroying. All these, he holds, are "division-makers" in the sense of Rom. 16, 17. V. 18 he does not adduce. And yet it is this verse, the context of v. 17, which clearly indicates that *Paul is speaking of such as may no longer be regarded as Christians*. "For they that are such," Paul states unequivocally and without reservation or restriction, "*serve not our Lord Jesus Christ but their own belly and by good words [fair speaking which simulates goodness] and fair speeches [language artfully adapted to captivate the hearer] deceive the hearts of the simple.*" Compare the detailed study of Rom. 16, 17-18 in *Christian Prayer-Fellowship and Unionism*, pp. 10-24, where it has been shown that a contextual and fair interpretation of these verses will not warrant their application to such erring persons or teachers as must still be regarded as holding to the fundamentals of Christianity and hence as Christians, and that Paul probably has in mind the antichristian Judaistic teachers who dogged his footsteps from city to city in order to undo his gospel work and against whose coming to Rome Paul forewarns the Romans incidentally at the end of his epistle while listing those to whom he wished to send greetings.

The interpretation and application of Rom. 16, 17 to *Christian* teachers of error in nonfundamentals and to their adherents is therefore in violation of the clear statements of Paul in v. 18. *By using the passage thus, Dr. Arndt omits or "subtracts" a vital part from Paul's statement and constructs a doctrine that is in violation of the Scriptures.* Is such a use of the Scriptures not just as much "a serious offense" as the "deviations" from the Scriptures which Dr. Arndt finds fault with in Christians not affiliated with the Synodical Conference and which he erects as barriers to prayer-fellowship. On his own interpretation and application of Rev. 22, 18, must he not condemn himself as guilty of "adding to or subtracting from" the Scriptures? Assuredly, if one may deal with statements of Scripture as Dr. Arndt does with Rom. 16, 17 and other passages, there is nothing that would prevent us from proving by the same method that the Scriptures teach atheism in the words of Psalm 14, 1: "There is no God." For if, for example, v. 18 may be ignored when quoting and applying Rom. 16, 17, what need should there be to pay heed to the preceding and following context of the words "there is no God" in Psalm 14, 1, which states that it is the "fool" who declares thus and that such are "corrupt"? Similarly, what fault would it involve if we should ignore the context of Col. 2, 21 ("Touch not, taste not, handle not!") and on the basis of these words, taken by themselves, maintain that the Scriptures urge us to practice complete abstinence with regard to certain foods, drinks, etc.? Indeed, the context of a Bible passage is vital to its understanding and proper application, and ignoring it or playing fast and loose with it reduces Scripture to the proverbial waxen nose that may be bent or fashioned to one's liking.

And this leads to another observation. An argument is no stronger than its weakest link. The links in Dr. Arndt's chain of arguments are the Bible passages he adduces. In view of the fact demonstrated in this and the preceding paragraphs

that the passages adduced by him are applied in violation of their contexts or otherwise do not warrant the conclusions drawn from them, must it not be said truthfully that his links are not only weak but are completely missing?

10. Page 65, par. 2. Here Dr. Arndt attempts to defend his position against the possible charge that it leads to a refusal of prayer-fellowship to true children of God, by claiming that this fact, while true and regrettable, cannot be altered, *because we are not omniscient*, that is, because we cannot see into the hearts of Christians not affiliated with the Synodical Conference and so assure ourselves that they really are Christians. In other words, Dr. Arndt assumes that confessing Christians outside of the Synodical Conference cannot be known to us as Christians, not even as weak Christians, by their public confessions—in the case of the Lutheran bodies not affiliated with the Synodical Conference their confessions are our own Lutheran confessions—but presumably only by personal intercourse and catechization. Though in their public confessions they hold to the foundation, Christ, these confessions are assumed to be nullified by the doctrinal error (not faith-destroying) which they contain, and hence are held to afford no basis for regarding confessing Christians not affiliated with the Synodical Conference as true Christians and therefore as fit for prayer-fellowship.

But are these assumptions valid and tenable?

What right has Dr. Arndt to make Christian prayer-fellowship dependent on the distinct knowledge that Christians not affiliated with the Synodical Conference really and truly are Christians, *when he cannot and does not require such knowledge of our own Missouri Lutheran Christians?* Dr. Arndt can look into the hearts of members of the Synodical Conference as little as into the hearts of those not affiliated with the Synodical Conference. With regard to the former he charitably assumes, on the basis of their acceptance of our Lutheran confessions, that they are Christians; with regard to the latter—even the Lutherans among them who accept those same confessions—he holds that we *cannot* make such a charitable assumption *a priori*, but must ascertain through catechization whether they really are Christians and fit to be prayed with. Considering that a person's true Christianity is dependent not on orthodoxy in all nonfundamental doctrines, but on faith in Christ as Redeemer, that is indeed a strange position to take. But stranger still is this that while Dr. Arndt holds that his lack of omniscience prevents him from discerning the true Christians among those who are not affiliated with the Synodical Conference though they confess Christ as Redeemer, he nevertheless holds that he *can* ascertain their true Christianity by catechization, *his lack of omniscience notwithstanding*. Or does catechization endow the catechizer with omniscience so that he can actually peer into the hearts of those he catechizes? If not, then Dr. Arndt must after all, and in spite of his catechization, *make the charitable assumption that they are Christians*. But if charitable assumption is necessary in the end, why deny it to begin with in the case of Lutherans not affiliated with the Synodical Conference or in the case of other denominations who hold to the foundation, Christ, by alleging lack of omniscience?

Furthermore, what right has Dr. Arndt to regard the Christian confessions of those not affiliated with the Synodical Conference as nullified by reason of the nonfundamental doctrinal error contained in them and as unable to reveal to us as Christians those who confess them, when in our own church practice (compare Dr. Walther's theses and statements in *Lehre und Wehre*, 1868, and *Christian Prayer-Fellowship and Unionism*, pp. 89-94) we set up quite different principles with respect to doctrinal error and its relation to prayer-fellowship? Do the Scriptures prescribe one set of principles for the Christians of the Synodical Conference and another for the Christians outside of it? Do they not set forth the same principles for all

Christians alike? Yet in Dr. Arndt's view the confessions of the Lutherans outside of the Synodical Conference and those of the fundamentalist Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, etc., are not sufficiently scriptural to enable us to regard them as fellow-members of the universal church! Confession of Christ as Redeemer (in the biblical sense, of course) is not sufficient for him to enable him to regard them as brethren in Christ; it must be, also in all nonfundamental doctrines, the full confession of the Synodical Conference. *And thereby Dr. Arndt virtually eliminates the scriptural doctrine of the universal church, in so far as it has a bearing on the question of prayer-fellowship, and practically restricts the communion of saints to the Synodical Conference.* Apparently Dr. Arndt does not realize how thoroughly inconsistent he is. For as a Missourian he must admit that we give the doctrine of the universal church due consideration, both theoretically and practically, when we recognize the various church bodies that hold to the foundation, Christ, as Christian bodies and respect their parochial limits by not viewing their members as "mission material." And yet, when the question of prayer-fellowship arises, he suddenly changes front and declares that we cannot pray with them because we cannot see into their hearts and determine absolutely that they are Christians! If the latter is true, what real basis is there for holding the former?

Toward the end of the paragraph Dr. Arndt asserts: "True love for my neighbor . . . dictates the course outlined." While it is true that love should lead us to call attention to weaknesses in doctrine and life when observed and when opportunity offers, *is it not equally true that love demands that we charitably assume with regard to all who confess Christ as their Redeemer and do not negate that confession by faith-destroying doctrine or life that they are fellow members of the body of Christ, weaknesses in nonfundamental doctrines and in life notwithstanding, and likewise that we refrain from taking Bible passages out of their contexts and from using them to erect unscriptural barriers to prayer-fellowship against such Christians?* Assuredly, the Spirit of Christ should lead us to do that much.

11. Page 66, par. 1. One is struck here by the way in which Dr. Arndt refers to doctrinally erring Christians not affiliated with the Synodical Conference. He refers to them not as Christians but as "people bearing the Christian name but advocating erroneous teachings." To him they are, for practical purposes, merely *nominal* Christians, even as on pp. 61 f. he used the case of *nominal* Christians to illustrate his point. Furthermore, the fact that on p. 61 he stated that "where there is no evidence of the existence of this unseen bond, there is no justification for prayer-fellowship" indicates that when on pp. 61-66 he discusses Christians who err doctrinally in nonfundamentals and with whom he holds prayer-fellowship to be impossible, he obviously regards them as such in whom evidence of the existence of this unseen bond of faith in the divine Savior, which unites all Christians in one universal church, *is lacking*. Dr. Arndt states at the end of the paragraph that his discussion is concerned "with the laying down of general principles," and our review of the previous paragraphs has amply shown that the assumption that evidence of the existence of the unseen bond of faith in Christ is lacking in persons outside of the Synodical Conference who err doctrinally is indeed the basic principle underlying the entire argumentation on pp. 61-66. That a Christian should take it upon himself to rule that all professing Christians differing from him in nonfundamental doctrines should, for purpose of prayer-fellowship, be considered only as *nominal* Christians and therefore *a priori* disbarred from prayer-fellowship is almost beyond the power of one's imagination. Instead of assuming, as in Christian love we should assume, that all who profess Christ as their Savior and do not negate this profession by an ungodly life or by adherence to doctrines that necessarily

destroy Christian faith, Dr. Arndt proceeds on the unscriptural assumption that the Christianity of all who differ from him or the Synodical Conference in nonfundamental doctrines is, as a general principle, to be held in suspicion and for practical purposes to be regarded as nominal only. How different Paul in 1 Cor. 3, 10-15 and in Eph. 4, 1-6. Compare also what was stated above on p. 106. 7.

Dr. Arndt is aware of the extreme to which his "general principle" is taking him and is himself not ready to go all the way. He speaks of "hundreds of cases where special circumstances obtain and a number of factors have to be considered before one can pronounce on the course that should be followed." As if there could be exceptions to his "general principle" once he has declared his belief that the Scriptures *forbid* prayer-fellowship with erring Christians not of the Synodical Conference. When the Scriptures have *forbidden* a thing, may Dr. Arndt make exceptions or grant special dispensations? And what are the "special circumstances" or the "number of factors" that constitute the exceptions? *The Scriptures, as Dr. Arndt interprets them, know of no exceptions and make no exceptions.* Our theologians of the past generation who were responsible for the older literature on the subject of prayer-fellowship were at least consistent and *ruled out any exceptions*, as is apparent from the summary by Rev. E. Eckhardt (see *Re-appeal*, pp. 10 f.). Dr. Arndt, however, while clearly holding in all essentials the same position as they, undertakes to make exceptions which the older theologians held to be *excluded because forbidden*. As a Christian he feels no doubt the violation of Christian unity and Christian brotherly fellowship which his extreme position demands, and under pressure of his Christian conscience he seeks special circumstances and factors that will, in his mind, permit him to exercise prayer-fellowship and avoid what he himself feels is unchristian conduct. That is fine. But why be inconsistent about it? *Why not acknowledge that the making of exceptions in a matter which the Scriptures forbid virtually overthrows what he regards as a Scriptural prohibition*, and why not proceed to restudy the Scriptures to see if they really do lay down as a "general principle" what under certain circumstances his own Christian conscience would condemn as in violation of the doctrine of the church and thus in violation of the Scriptures? If Dr. Arndt would do this with an open mind and with due consideration of the context of the relevant Bible passages, he would soon discover that the Bible passages which he cites as proving his "general principle" do not in reality substantiate it. For surely, if in proving a "general principle" one must use Bible passages in violation of their context or deduce unwarranted conclusions from them, the "general principle" cannot with any degree of truth he said to be *scriptural*.

What Dr. Arndt says concerning a possible implication of compromise of truth, of unionism, and of giving of offense in certain cases of prayer-fellowship with those who differ from us in doctrine is true. In fact, the implication of one or more of these undesirable features is the only barrier to prayer-fellowship among Christians that the Scriptures recognize (see *Christian Prayer-Fellowship and Unionism*, pp. 49-101), and it is likewise the only barrier that Synod recognized when it approved and adopted the doctrinal statement embodied in the *Committee Report at Cleveland in 1935* (see pp. 10 f. and 33-35 of this *Re-appeal*), and the only barrier that is in agreement with Synod's position on prayer-fellowship as stated in its Catechism in answer to Question 222: "Because all believers are in Christ the children of one Father and should, therefore, pray for and with each other." The statement accepted at Synod implies that prayer-fellowship with Christians not affiliated with the Synodical Conference is permissible and in keeping with the doctrine of the universal church and therefore God-pleasing, being prohibited only when it involves compromise of the truth, unionism, or giving of offense, and there-

fore declares that cases of prayer-fellowship are cases of casuistry concerning which the individual Christian must decide whether one of the above-named objectionable features is involved or not. *Why has Dr. Arndt departed from this position, which he himself accepted as scriptural at Synod in 1935? And why does he now in his booklet attempt to set forth as scriptural a position which, by implication, was rejected by Synod?*

12. Page 66, par. 2. In this paragraph Dr. Arndt would class all who do not agree to his "general principle"—and that, as we have seen, includes also Synod since its adoption of the Committee Report in 1935—as unionists, latitudinarians, and indifferentists. Would it not have been better if Dr. Arndt had first made sure of the scripturalness of his own position? It ill becomes him who applies Scripture in violation of context to find fault with or to condemn those who would practice Christian prayer-fellowship *within truly scriptural limits*.

SUMMARY

Our examination of pp. 60-67 of Dr. Arndt's *Christian Prayer* has thus yielded the following results:

1) The Bible passage on which Dr. Arndt bases his position that adherence to false doctrine is a priori a barrier to prayer-fellowship either do not justify the conclusions which Dr. Arndt draws from them, as is the case with 2 Thess. 3, 6-15 and Matt. 28, 20, or they are used by Dr. Arndt in violation of the clear statements or implications of their context, as is the case with John 8, 31-32; Rom. 16, 17; 1 John 4, 1, and Rev. 22, 18 f. *Dr. Arndt's position thus is without Scripture proof, hence unscriptural.*

2) Dr. Arndt negates his own "Scripture proof" by making allowances and exceptions which his Bible passages, as interpreted by himself, do not make and which certain former theologians, whom he is following in his interpretation and application, *declared could not be made.*

3) Dr. Arndt's position, in which he views Christians outside of the Synodical Conference for purposes of prayer-fellowship as merely nominal Christians, clearly violates the doctrine of the universal church and departs from the apostolic practice of regarding all who confess Christ as their Redeemer as fellow members of the body of Christ and dealing with them on that basis.

4) Dr. Arndt's position violates the position on prayer-fellowship adopted by Synod in 1935 and therewith also the position taken in our Catechism in answer to Question 222.

Are your delegates supplied with copies of this "Re-appeal"?